


# Braille Monitor



OCTOBER, 1983

VOICE OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2010 with funding from  
National Federation of the Blind (NFB)

<http://www.archive.org/details/braillemonitoroc83nati>

# THE BRAILLE MONITOR

PUBLICATION OF THE  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

OCTOBER 1983

## CONTENTS

CONVENTION 1983. . . . .	365
PRESIDENTIAL REPORT. . . . . by Kenneth Jernigan	370
BLEECKER LEAVES NAC ADMIDST CONTROVERSY SAYS HE THINKS IT'S TIME FOR HIM TO PLAY IN ANOTHER SANDBOX. . . . .	384
TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE: THE LAW AND THE ORGANIZED BLIND MOVEMENT . . . . . by Marc Maurer	396
PAC HITS RECORD HIGH . . . . .	404
DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE BLIND AS MOBILITY INSTRUCTORS: THE CERTIFICATION RACKET . . . . . by Fred Schroeder	407
THE BLIND AND THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF TRAVEL . . . . . by Martin J. Darity	412
LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY: CURRENT APPLICATIONS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS. . . . . by Frank Kurt Cylke	415
EOC OFFICE RECEPTIONISTS PROVING SIGHTLESS CAN BE USEFUL WORKERS. . . . . by Charlie Rahm	418
AND THE WINNER IS... . . . . by Gerald M. Kass	420
CONCERNING MEMBERS, ASSOCIATES, AND CONTESTS . . . . . by Kenneth Jernigan	426
BLINDNESS: THE OTHER HALF OF INERTIA. . . . . by Kenneth Jernigan	432

HAWAII AND CALIFORNIA RECEIVE CHARTERS . . . . .	443
SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW SCHOLARSHIPS AND AN EXPANDED PROGRAM. . . . .	444
SHARON GOLD RECEIVES JACOBUS TENBROEK AWARD. . . . .	447
BLIND OF DALLAS ACHIEVE BIG SUCCESS: GOVERNOR AND MAYOR ISSUE PROCLAMATIONS . . . . .	449
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND TRIES IT STATE BY STATE: NEW TACTICS--SAME OLD OBJECTIVE . . . . .	451
RECIPES. . . . .	454
MONITOR MINIATURES . . . . .	456
RESOLUTIONS - 1983 . . . . .	466
CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND AS AMENDED 1983 . . . . .	489

## THE BRAILLE MONITOR

Published monthly in inkprint, Braille, and on talking-book discs by

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

KENNETH JERNIGAN, *President*

National Office  
1800 Johnson Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21230

Letters for the President, address changes,  
subscription requests, and orders for NFB literature,  
articles for the *Monitor* and letters to the editor  
should be sent to the National Office.

\* \* \*

*Monitor* subscriptions cost the Federation about fifteen dollars per year. Members are invited, and non-members are requested, to cover the subscription cost. Donations should be made payable to National Federation of the Blind and sent to:

Richard Edlund, *Treasurer*  
National Federation of the Blind  
Box 11185  
Kansas City, Kansas 66111

\* \* \*

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND IS NOT AN ORGANIZATION  
SPEAKING FOR THE BLIND—IT IS THE BLIND SPEAKING FOR THEMSELVES

ISSN 0006-8829



## CONVENTION 1983

Every convention has its own special mood and tone, and the 1983 Convention of the National Federation of the Blind was no exception. Held at the Radisson Muehlebach Hotel in Kansas City during the first week of July, the Convention attracted near record numbers. Attendance was sharply up.

It was not a boisterous meeting. Rather, it was one of deep joy and a sense of fulfillment—of pride in the past and confidence in the future. The feeling of closeness and dedication which permeated every activity was unmistakable. On the final day in a summary statement, President Jernigan characterized it as a "thoughtful convention," and most people agreed. Other terms which come to mind are maturity, in-depth understanding of the issues, determination, and clarity and firmness of purpose. But above all was the sense of closeness. There was no need to emphasize or call attention to it. It was obvious and unmistakable.

Every year the crowds come earlier. This time some began arriving by Wednesday, June 29. By Thursday we were there by the hundreds, and by Friday the Hotel was full.

Saturday, July 2, witnessed the formation of the Parents Division of the National Federation of the Blind, along with an all-day seminar. Susan Ford of Missouri was elected President of the new Division, and Barbara Cheadle continues to edit Future Reflections, our magazine for parents of blind children, which is now being circulated by the thousands throughout the country and

which is setting the standard and establishing the tone in the field.

On Sunday, July 3, the Convention was fully in action—registration, the largest number of exhibits we have ever had, spirited discussions at the Resolutions Committee, and dozens of meetings of Committees and groups. Hospitality and conversation were occurring in both the Presidential and the Missouri Suites, and the annual Wine and Cheese Tasting Party sponsored by the Cultural Exchange and International Program Committee was its usual success.

On Monday morning, July 4, the Board of Directors met at nine o'clock. All of the members of the Board were present, and so were more than a thousand other Federationists. An amendment was proposed to Article IV Section C of the Constitution, and the Board unanimously recommended its passage. The following day the Convention overwhelmingly adopted the amendment. Before the amendment Article IV Section C read as follows:

"The National Federation of the Blind shall have a Board of Directors, which shall be composed of the five officers, the immediate past President, and nine additional members, five of whom shall be elected at the annual Convention in 1978 and four of whom shall be those elected to the Board of Directors for two-year terms at the annual Convention in 1977. With the exception of the immediate past President, members of the Board of Directors shall serve for two-year terms. The terms of the Board members elected in 1977 shall expire in 1979; and the terms of those elected in

1978 shall expire in 1980."

The amendment re-wrote Article IV Section C as follows:

"The National Federation of the Blind shall have a Board of Directors, which shall be composed of the five officers and ten additional members, five of whom shall be elected at the annual Convention during even numbered years and five of whom shall be elected at the annual Convention during odd numbered years. The members of the Board of Directors shall serve for two-year terms."

Resolution 83-101 (published elsewhere in this issue) put the Convention on record as confirming the action of the Board of Directors in reorganizing the Hawaii affiliate. The new affiliate (the National Federation of the Blind of Hawaii) was established June 9, 1983, and at that time the Hawaii members voted to sign and ratify the Charter of Affiliation with the national body. Bill Smith (the new President of the NFB of Hawaii) was present at the Board Meeting, and at that time both he and President Jernigan publicly signed the Charter of Affiliation. The Charter was later presented to President Smith in a ceremony at the banquet Thursday evening, July 7, and a duplicate original now hangs in the Hall of Charters at the National Center for the Blind in Baltimore. Thus, the Hall of Charters is now complete, with all fifty-one affiliates being represented.

Bill Smith (an ex-police official from Chicago) is a man of determination, sturdy character, and sensitivity. He spoke to the group and pledged to build a stronger Hawaii affiliate than we have ever had, and no one present doubted that he would do it. The other members of the Hawaii delegation were also in-

troduced: Bill's wife Ann; First Vice President Barbara Reid and her husband Walter; and the Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Floyd Matson. Of course, Dr. Matson is no stranger to the Federation. He worked with Dr. tenBroek in the fifties and sixties, was editor of the Monitor, and with Dr. tenBroek co-authored Hope Deferred. He is now a Professor at the University of Hawaii.

There was real joy at the admission of the new Hawaii affiliate and the signing of the Charter. It was felt that Warren Toyama and his group would have little chance in trying to disrupt the affiliate or retain the right to use the name Hawaii Federation of the Blind. So it was to prove, for in mid-July the federal court in Hawaii granted a preliminary injunction prohibiting the Toyama group from using the name. It would appear that the whole question of the sovereignty of the national body, the relationship with affiliates, and the entire question of chartering is behind us. This was one of the reasons for the joy and harmony of the Convention.

At the Board Meeting and at the opening general session on Tuesday morning Billie Weaver (the able and energetic President of the host affiliate) welcomed the Convention and demonstrated the charm and warmth of Missouri hospitality. At the Tuesday morning session a letter from Governor Christopher Bond was read along with an official proclamation, declaring July to be National Federation of the Blind Month in Missouri.

The Convention began on an upbeat note of positiveness and harmony, and the mood intensified as the week progressed. On Tuesday afternoon the Presidential Report (reprinted elsewhere in this



issue) detailed the accomplishments of the past year. Then we heard from William Bradford Reynolds, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice. He spoke on "Civil Rights in the 1980's: Policy Trends and Perspectives." His remarks were followed by a spirited give and take of questions from the audience. The afternoon session concluded with a presentation entitled "Civil Rights in Action: The Battle in Little Rock." The discussion was led by Jim Hudson, President of the National Federation of the Blind of Arkansas, and Joe Register, the President of the Little Rock Chapter.

Jim Gashel, our Director of Governmental Affairs, was slated to give his Washington Report at the Tuesday afternoon session, but the questions and discussion on the other topics were so lively that the Washington Report had to be put over until Friday. This was the way it went throughout the week—crowded sessions (at times more than 2,000), interesting presentations, and never enough time for all of the questions and comments. Elections occurred Wednesday morning, and five Board positions were filled. Those elected were: Sid Allen of West Virginia, Norman Gardner of Idaho, Allen Harris of Michigan, Theresa Herron of New Hampshire, and Ralph Sanders of Maryland. Reverend Howard May of Connecticut and Sterling France of New York left the Board, and Sid Allen and Terry Herron were new. Terry is the President of the NFB of New Hampshire, and Sid is a long-time leader and member of the NFB of West Virginia. The terms of the five officers and the other five Board Members will expire in 1984.

There were many highpoints of the

convention. Some of these will be reported in this issue of the Monitor and others in later issues. Guy Carboneau, President of Triformation Systems, talked about technology and the production of Braille. Charles Cook, General Partner of Community Computing, Inc. talked about the future of technology. We discussed the Cross-Country walk being made by Bill Morgan, who will be setting a world record as the first blind person to walk from coast to coast; and we discussed the bicycle ride of Charles Smead which was then in progress from California to Kankakee, Illinois. This ride sponsored by the Prairie State Chapter of the NFB of Illinois was undertaken to secure publicity and raise funds for the national treasury. Smead, who is blind, had hoped to talk to the Convention by speaker phone from Denver (where he was at the time), but this was not possible.

We heard from Gerald Kass, Executive Vice President of the Jewish Braille Institute of America, and from Frank Kurt Cylke, Director of the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. We also had a presentation on "Freedom of Travel" from Martin J. Darity, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Tourism.

On Thursday Helen O'Rourke (who is Vice President, Philanthropic Advisory Service Division, National Council of Better Business Bureaus) spoke to us concerning "Standards and Accountability." We had searching questions to ask her as to why certain organizations in our field which have provably violated any reasonable standard of propriety, ethics, and accountability have not received adverse reports from the Council of Better Business Bureaus. She

promised to look into the matter, and we believe she will. She stayed throughout most of the Thursday session and attended the banquet that evening. She indicated that she was leaving with a better understanding of our organization than she had ever had and a different view of its scope and objectives. In the presence of the thousands of blind persons who were actively and knowledgeably participating in the meeting, it could hardly have been otherwise.

Mrs. Ramona Walhof, the new Director of the Idaho Commission for the Blind, reported on developments in Idaho; and Jim Hudson, President of the National Federation of the Blind of Arkansas, talked about changes which are occurring in programs for the blind in his state. One of the most moving times of the convention came when Bill Joyce, blind and almost deaf, told us about his personal struggles for independence and the success he has made in building a large communications company. Marc Maurer (President of the National Association of Blind Lawyers) spoke eloquently on the topic: "To Establish Justice: The Law and the Organized Blind Movement." Marc is in private practice in Baltimore.

Ellen Shong, Director of the Office of Federal Contract and Compliance Programs of the United States Department of Labor, spoke on the topic: "Affirmative Action: Where is It—Where is It Going." Her presentation aroused so much interest and discussion and so many questions that the morning session ran far into the lunch period.

A great part of Thursday afternoon was taken up with a discussion concerning sheltered shops, the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act, minimum wage legislation, and re-

lated matters. We heard from union representatives, from the Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, and from Don A. Zimmerman, who is a member of the National Labor Relations Board. We also had a number of presentations from our own leaders and members, and there was a great deal of interaction and comment and question. It was an afternoon well spent.

During the Convention we also heard from Fred Schroeder, President of the National Federation of the Blind of New Mexico and Coordinator of Low Incidence Programs for the Albuquerque Public Schools. He spoke on the topic: "Discrimination Against the Blind as Mobility Instructors: The Certification Racket."

Tony Burda (a blind Pharmacist and one of our active members from Illinois) talked to us about his work and experiences. He is a Poison Information Specialist at the Poison Control Center, Rush-Presbyterian-St. Lukes Medical Center in Chicago. We also heard from Gail Crowe, who works as a disc jockey at station KCSJ in Pueblo, Colorado. His success provides a conclusive answer as to whether a blind person (qualified and motivated) can compete on terms of equality with the sighted in working at a commercial radio station.

The banquet is always a highpoint of spirit and information. This year was no exception. Reverend Howard May (Chairman of our Scholarship Committee) made presentations as follows: Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship, \$1,250, to Clyde Terry of Concord, New Hampshire; Melva T. Owen Memorial Scholarship, \$1,200, to Kimberly Gardner of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and two Hermione

Grant Calhoun Scholarships, \$2,500 each, to Marianne Dearstyne of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, and Lettie Jackson of Austin, Texas. First Vice President Donald Capps was Master of Ceremonies, and President Jernigan delivered the banquet address. As has already been noted, a Charter of Affiliation was presented to Bill Smith, President of the National Federation of the Blind of Hawaii.

Symbolizing the victorious conclusion of our long battle for justice in California, a Charter (to become effective August 1, 1983) was presented to Sharon Gold, President of the National Federation of the Blind of California. With the announcement that we are at long last resuming our rightful name in California, the audience shouted its delight and enthusiasm. And there was a final touch—a frosting on the cake. In recognition of her steadfastness, determination, and dedication Sharon Gold was given the Jacobus tenBroek Award. Mrs. tenBroek was present at the podium, and her words and her presence were a living, vibrant symbol of what we are and what we have become as an organization.

On Friday the winners of the Associates contest were announced, and the prizes were given. The first prize of \$1,000 went to Sandy Sanderson of Alaska; the second prize of \$500 went to Tom Stevens of Missouri; the third prize of \$200 went to Karen Mayry of South Dakota; and the fourth prize of \$100 went to

Sharon Gold of California. In addition to the cash prizes these four winners were also given a ribbon colored red, white, and blue. As a recognition for having recruited fifty or more Associates, three other people received the special ribbons: Marsha Crickmore of Indiana, Darrel Nather of Alaska, and Alan Glickman of Illinois. There is every indication that Sandy Sanderson will be seriously challenged for first place in the coming year. On Friday we also heard the Washington Report, dealt with resolutions, and discussed financial matters and other business. On Saturday we topped things off with a rousing JOB (Job Opportunities for the Blind) Seminar.

Many people felt that it was the most thought provoking, the most harmonious, the most inspirational, and the all around best Convention we have ever had. It was a time of renewal—a time to remember and look back over the past year, and a time to look forward and plan for the future: and remember and plan we did. It was all that a Federation Convention should be and repeatedly is. It was the blind themselves (the blind of the nation) coming together to plan their destiny and decide their future. Whether one likes it or resents it, finds it pleasant or repugnant, is stimulated by it or revolted by the thought of it, the plain truth is this: Nobody else in the whole world has a convention like ours, for nobody else can.

**PRESIDENTIAL REPORT**

by Kenneth Jernigan, President  
Delivered at the Annual Convention of the  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
Kansas City, Missouri  
July 5, 1983

Twelve months ago I began my report by saying to you: "This has been a year of severe challenge, tremendous accomplishment, and unbelievable acceleration." Today I begin by saying: The year just ended has been more of the same, except on a larger scale. Never in all of our history have we experienced during a comparable period of time such opposition and such triumph.

The growth of our influence and prestige can be seen in the proclamations and pronouncements which continue to come from governors, mayors, and other public officials. Last October there was a veritable flood of these documents—ranging from National Federation of the Blind Week, proclaimed by the Executive and Council of Pierce County, Washington, to White Cane Safety Days and White Cane Safety Weeks proclaimed by mayors, legislatures, and other public bodies from Danbury, Connecticut, to Los Angeles and San Francisco. The Governor of New Mexico named April of this year National Federation of the Blind Month. The Governor of South Dakota followed suit in May, and the Governor of Indiana proclaimed May 15 to May 21 White Cane Week, saying that he did it "in recognition of the efforts of the National Federation of the Blind." As you have already heard, July is National Federation of the Blind Month here in Missouri. In making the Proclamation Governor Bond said: "It is com-

mendable that the blind and visually impaired are speaking for themselves with a positive voice through the National Federation of the Blind." Of course, we agree with him, and we intend to do more of the same.

Last September Jim Gashel and I were invited to meet with Vice President Bush. We went to his office and spent almost an hour, talking with him about our problems and needs and what we thought the Administration should do. Although I am not totally happy with the follow-through and feel that the Administration has missed many opportunities to demonstrate concern and take positive action, the very fact of our invitation to meet with the Vice President of the United States indicates a good deal and speaks for itself.

Then, there is the increasing coverage which we are getting on radio and television. Charles Biebl, our one-man public relations squad, continues to line up local and national appearances for us, and our day to day activities generate public recognition. Our March on Washington is a good example. As a direct result of the contacts made at that time, I appeared on February 11 of this year on the nationwide television program C-Span. The program occurred during prime time. It also occurred during a blizzard. No cabs were running, and I had to wade through knee deep snow drifts for several blocks from

---



the Washington, D. C., train station to the studio—but I got there.

I don't have to tell you about our radio spots. You have been taking them to local radio stations all over the country, and several networks are using them on a continuing basis. They blanket the nation, carrying our name and our message everywhere radio reaches.

Now, we have new television spots. In a minute we will put them on so that you can see for yourselves what they are like. There are six of them. Each runs for twenty-nine and three-quarter seconds. How is that for precision? Two of them are ready for release now (you can get them in the exhibit area); two will be ready for release late this fall; and the final two will be released early next year. These television spots took a lot of work, and they cost us over \$20,000. That is one way that our money is spent—but they are worth every penny of it. When you experience them for yourselves, I believe you will share with me a feeling of pride in the message they carry and the image of blindness they portray. Here they are:

[At this point in the Report the new informational television spots were shown on a large video screen. The audience responded with enthusiasm. The Report was then resumed as follows:]

So there are our television spots. They demonstrate the way our movement functions. A local or state affiliate would have difficulty producing spots of such technical excellence. This is the job of the National Office, but the National Office cannot effectively get them to the stations and get them used. That is the job of the state and local affiliates. It is your job as individual members. Use these spots. Take

them to the stations, and get them on the air—but take only what you are prepared to use. Each set costs almost \$15.00. As I have told you on the presidential releases, these television spots are now beginning to be used by the networks. Let's get the kind of mileage from them that we have got from the radio spots.

Perhaps the progress of the past year can best be summed up in four captions: construction, computerization, civil rights, and concerted action. First, let's talk about construction. At the National Center for the Blind in Baltimore (our headquarters and our focus of operations) one major remodeling project has just been completed, and another is about to get underway. The National Center for the Blind is the pride of all of us in the movement. It is Federalism taking shape in tangible form.

But to achieve our goals and do what we plan requires more than talk or pride. It requires work and money. The new heating system at the Center is installed; the windows have been replaced; most of the interior remodeling is done; and the new electrical service is in and functioning. It cost several hundred thousand dollars to do all of this; but we found the money, and we did it. The current project involves putting new roofs on all of the buildings, cleaning and repairing the external masonry, doing waterproofing, and making a variety of other miscellaneous repairs. We are probably talking about close to half a million dollars, but when this round of remodeling is finished, there is no major project left which I can see that we have to do. The Center should be in good repair for years to come, with a minimum of main-

tenance and upkeep. Moreover, it is ours. It does not belong to the government or some agency. It belongs to us, to the blind. We have sweated and sacrificed to get it, and it is now a reality. The National Center for the Blind is not just brick or mortar but better lives for blind people and the tangible promise of hope fulfilled and a dream come true. When the blind came to build, we did it right.

Yes, we will have to find more money during the coming year. We will have to make increased effort and further sacrifice—but we will put forth the effort; we will make the sacrifice; and we will find the money. The pride which the blind feel in the Center is shown by the number of groups and individuals who have come to use it since our last convention. Affiliates and chapters have chartered buses for weekends, and individuals have come in a steady stream.

It was twelve years ago (in Houston in 1971) that we first passed a resolution that we would get a building and establish a headquarters. It took a long time and a lot of work, but we did what we said we would do. We always keep our promises—to our opponents, to our friends, and (yes) to ourselves. We have kept the promise which we made twelve years ago in Houston, and what a Center we have!

During the last year we have undergone a veritable revolution in the computerization of our operation. Computerized accounting, wordprocessing, and Braille are now a regular part of our daily life. You have seen evidence of it in this convention, and you will see more of it in the months ahead. It touches almost every phase of what we do. It makes it possible for us to give more

service to the members at greater speed and less cost than ever before.

JOB—Job Opportunities for the Blind: As you know, we have been operating this program in partnership with the United States Department of Labor since December of 1979. During that time we have helped 330 blind people find employment—and the pace is increasing. Since January of this year, JOB has dealt with more than 2,000 blind people. We have sent educational material to more than 6,000 employers. We have conducted ten seminars for applicants and one for employers. We now have a network of a hundred Volunteer Field Representatives throughout the country. Of course, the bottom line is employment for blind people, and I am pleased to tell you that in June of this year 11 JOB applicants went to work in jobs paying more than the minimum wage. Of course, we will ask the Labor Department to renew the contract again this fall, and I believe they will do it. One more thing: Last month JOB received a complete federal audit. And here is what we got—absolute approval and not one single criticism or recommendation for change. How do you think that will sit with our opponents?

I have already mentioned this year's March on Washington. Some 200 of us came from throughout the country to participate. The first activity was a public relations seminar Saturday, January 29. It was planned and conducted by Barbara Pierce and Ralph Sanders, and what a success it was! Not only did our members get valuable information but we also made important contacts. Representatives were present from Cable News Network, the Washington Post and C-Span. I have told you one of the

immediate results of the C-Span contact. That's how it works. Planning and concerted action. It means something to be a member of the National Federation of the Blind.

For the first time since we have been conducting our annual Marches on Washington, I was unable to be there. I had to be in California to appear in the Acosta-Eisenberg lawsuit. However, I spoke to the assembled group on Sunday night by long distance speaker telephone. If I had known what Monday, January 31, would bring, I would have made arrangements for a long distance speaker hook-up for that night as well.

As you know, on January 31, 1983, the courts gave us total victory in the Acosta lawsuit. When I called the hotel and gave the news to our assembled people, there was total pandemonium. I could hear it over the phone. I am told that people hugged each other in the aisles. Some (remembering the long struggle and the four years of battle) quietly wept.

The Acosta lawsuit was long and unpleasant, but it had its positive aspects. It caused us to examine ourselves and our movement to see precisely what kind of organization we want to be and what kind of structure we intend to have. Last year we adopted our new chartering system, and we drew together in strength and unity as never before in our history. The Charters are now signed, and in the future those who would attempt to destroy our movement (whether from without or within) will find themselves facing a solid phalanx—the blind, standing together as a unified movement.

After his licking in the courts, Acosta took a nose dive. If it were not for

all of the time and the money it has taken, we could view the events of the past few months as a comedy. Acosta and Eisenberg disregarded the terms of the court ordered settlement and were cited this spring on six counts of contempt. They are now up for another contempt hearing, and it would seem that justice is finally going to prevail. There were those who said that we would lose the Acosta battle or that we would ultimately grow tired and give up; but our well-known axiom should be kept in mind: We often lose skirmishes; we sometimes lose battles; but we never lose wars—for the war is never over until we win it. So much for Acosta.

There is one other matter which needs to be mentioned concerning the Charters. You will remember that Warren Toyama and the other members of the Hawaii delegation voted in favor of the new chartering system last year. In his capacity as President of the Hawaii affiliate Warren signed the Charter. This spring Warren and his associates decided that they did not want to approve the Charter but also that they did not want to give up the name Hawaii Federation of the Blind. We have now reorganized the affiliate and have asked the courts to prohibit Warren and his group from using our name. Of even more importance, the reorganized affiliate has vigorous leadership. Its President, Bill Smith, is dynamic and capable. I predict that we will shortly have a stronger and better Hawaii affiliate than we have ever known. On Thursday night at the banquet I will be giving Bill a Charter, and this will complete the process—every state chartered; every state standing together.

The March on Washington was to have

still other highpoints. On Tuesday afternoon, February 1, we assembled on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to review the day's activities and meet with Representative Barbara Kennelly. We were there by special order of Speaker Tip O'Neill, and Representative Kennelly said that she knew of no other group which had been accorded that honor.

But there was still more to come in this week of successes. On Wednesday, February 2, we learned we had won total victory in the Houston Lighthouse case. The Federal Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit had agreed last summer to reconsider its earlier decision. That decision had been unfavorable to us, the court saying that the blind shop workers were clients instead of employees. The rehearing occurred last fall. As I have already said, we got the good news during the March on Washington. The court reversed itself and ruled that the workers in Houston are full-fledged employees and that they are entitled to collective bargaining and the protection of the National Labor Relations Board.

In and of itself the Houston victory is important, but it takes on even more significance in view of events elsewhere. Let us begin with Cincinnati. We have been fighting that one for a long time. The Cincinnati Association for the Blind (one of the worst and most repressive workshops in the country) refused to allow its workers to organize and bargain collectively. That was several years ago, and the battle has been going on ever since. We beat them before the National Labor Relations Board; we beat them in the election as to whether the workers wanted a union; and we beat them in the Federal Court of

Appeals. The Court of Appeals ordered the Cincinnati Association to begin bargaining with the blind workers and the Teamsters. The Cincinnati Association refused to comply and continued its string of appeals. It went to the Supreme Court of the United States. So did we. In October of 1982 we got the good news. The Supreme Court decided in our favor. The Cincinnati Association had no choice and no appeal left. It was ordered to come up to the line and treat its blind workers like first-class citizens. We had to go all the way to the highest court in the land—but we went there, and we won. Negotiations between management and labor are now underway in both Cincinnati and Houston.

Then, there is Arkansas. As I reported to you last year, the overwhelming majority of the blind workers in the Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind signed cards to hold an election for a bargaining agent. The Lighthouse used such intimidation that (shortly after last year's convention) the workers narrowly voted to reject the union. We appealed to the National Labor Relations Board and asked that the results of the election be set aside. We argued that such intimidation had been used that a fair election could not be held. We asked that the Arkansas Lighthouse be ordered to bargain collectively, just as if the election had been won. I am pleased to tell you that only a few days ago the administrative law judge handed down his decision. We won it all the way. The Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind is ordered to recognize the union and bargain with the workers.

We started the battle for the rights of sheltered shop employees many decades ago. In the shops the blind employees



have been treated like slaves and cattle: They have been paid less than fifty cents an hour; they have been forced to work in unsanitary conditions; they have been browbeaten and cursed; and they have been subjected to every imaginable insult and abuse. In the early days the National Labor Relations Board ruled against us, saying that the blind workers were not workers at all but only clients. But we never lost hope, and we never gave up. We kept at it year after year. Then, our efforts began to pay off. The NLRB decided in our favor, and (despite the money and influence of National Industries for the Blind, the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped—NAC, and the workshop establishment) so did the courts. Cincinnati ... Houston ... Arkansas. Victories in all three places.

Of course, the battle is not over. It is still a long way to signed contracts and first-class treatment for the workers. But we are moving. Moreover, we remember Chicago. We were beaten there almost a decade ago, and the workers at the Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind still wear the yoke and suffer the indignities. But, Chicago, look to your going, and prepare yourself. We are now armed with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States—and we will be back.

There is another item which should be mentioned concerning sheltered workshops. The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act is the law which gives sheltered workshops permission to sell products to the federal government without competing against private business. We have repeatedly said that the Act needs to be reformed. It permits blind workers to

be paid less than the statutory minimum wage, and it allows for a variety of other abuses. Acting under color of this law, National Industries for the Blind has been established. NIB is the conduit for all federal contracts to the workshops for the blind, and it takes at least four percent off the top of every contract—sometimes as high as ten percent. And what does it do with all of the millions of dollars which it gets?

On May 17 and 18 of this year we had the opportunity to get at least a partial answer. We were able to get a hearing before the House Subcommittee responsible for the oversight of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act. The Committee is Chaired by Congressman Barney Frank of Massachusetts, who skillfully questioned NIB and sheltered workshop representatives. For one thing National Industries for the Blind admitted that it had spent \$50,000 to pay legal fees to fight the attempts of shop workers to organize. How much more it spent we do not know, but this is what it admitted. The hearings were highly successful, and it seems likely that there will be legislative reform. Jim Gashel will give you the details in his report, and you can read some of the actual transcripts of the hearings in the August-September Monitor. Senator Orin Hatch of Utah, who has worked closely with our National Office and with members of the Utah affiliate, will likely hold hearings on workshop matters this fall. Yes, we are making progress in reforming the workshops. At long last it would seem that the blind workers may come to have the rights enjoyed by other citizens, and be treated with the dignity of human beings—and it is happening because of the National Federation of the Blind.

I need to report to you about one final matter dealing with workshops. In Morristown, Tennessee, there is a shop called Volunteer Blind Industries. Most of the blind employees (there are about thirty) work in direct labor jobs. They make box springs and mattresses, and they package paper towels. The products are sold to the state and federal governments. The managers are sighted.

Early this year the workers began talking about setting up a local chapter of the National Federation of the Blind. They also talked about writing to their Congressman about conditions and hiring practices in the shop. They were concerned that the blind were being laid off while the sighted continued to work, and they thought the ratio of sighted to blind employees might violate the federal regulations under which the shop operates. They wanted information about the shop and its finances.

When the workshop supervisors learned of this, they confronted the workers and ordered them not to write to their Congressman or to participate in organizing an NFB chapter. We organized a chapter in Morristown near the end of May, and the shop workers did participate. In fact, the president of the chapter is none other than Taylor Smith, who is a shop worker at Volunteer Blind Industries of Morristown, Tennessee. Bobby Eason and Herbert Jenkins (also shop workers) are officers of the chapter. There have been threats that the workers will be fired. Telephone calls into and out of the plant (even emergency calls) have been curtailed and blocked.

In June I sent Jim Gashel to Morristown to meet with the shop manager and tell him that he would either stop the intimidation or face us in court. The

manager said that he would not permit Jim Gashel to meet with him in company with the shop workers, and he gave substance to his arrogance by placing guards at the plant door to prevent workers from coming to the office area. We have sworn statements that he has bragged, as he put it, that he "ran Jim Gashel off."

Well, we hired a constitutional lawyer from the faculty of the law school at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and we brought him to Baltimore for several days of backgrounding. He went to Morristown, interviewed the workers, took the testimony, and got the facts. On June 24 (just a little over a week ago) we filed with the NLRB unfair labor practices against Volunteer Blind Industries of Morristown, Tennessee, and the same day we filed a suit in the federal courts. When blind people are told that (on pain of losing their jobs) they cannot write to their Congressman and that they cannot belong to the National Federation of the Blind, we will either stand forth and fight or we will no longer deserve to be called Federationists. Yes, it will take money, and we will be subjected to attacks—but we will find the money, and we will stand forth to meet the attackers. We will teach the workshop bosses of Morristown, Tennessee, a lesson—so help us God.

Let me now turn to Social Security. Shortly after our 1981 convention, the Social Security Commissioner (pursuant to negotiations we had with him) signed a directive allowing for the promotion of blind persons to regular Claims Representative positions. However, our members in Pennsylvania found that (despite the new policy) there was contin-

uing discrimination. Spearheaded by our Pennsylvania affiliate, we went to court on behalf of the blind Social Security employees. That case is now at an end, and successfully.

The Social Security Administration agreed to select seven specific blind individuals for training as Claims Representatives (blind persons who had previously been denied such training). The group included Terry McManus and other Federationists from Pennsylvania. The order of the court is now in effect, and the individuals in question have just completed their training. In addition (and here is the broader significance of it) any blind Teleservice Representative working for Social Security in that entire federal region must (if he or she makes the best qualified list for a promotion) be selected over other candidates for training and promotion to Claims Representative jobs until September 30, 1984. Teleservice positions vacated by persons who are promoted will be filled by other blind individuals. The court decree is intended to establish affirmative action steps for employment of the blind in Social Security. Finally, the seven individuals have been awarded back pay from July 11, 1982, which amount is intended to compensate them for the promotions they should have received.

This is the kind of thing we spend our money for. This is what the Federation is all about. Yet, there are still blind people who do not join us and who wonder why we have a National Federation of the Blind.

Let me quickly deal with vending facility matters. How long have we been fighting the Jessie Nash case? It is truly a battle of historic significance,

and so are the victories we have won in the process. As far back as July, 1980, a federal arbitration panel ruled that the state of Georgia should have resisted when the United States Marine Corps decided to put Jessie Nash out of her vending facility. The state appealed to the federal court, and we beat them. The court ordered the state to attempt to recover the vending facility for Mrs. Nash. Month after month we continued the battle. The Marine Corps has now backed down completely. On February 4, 1983, Jessie Nash again became the operator of the very vending facility which had been illegally taken from her April 15, 1977. The only question now remaining is back pay. Both the arbitration panel and the federal court ordered back pay, but the state continues to resist. We have now asked the federal court to order the original arbitration panel to decide the amount which the state should pay to Jessie Nash. There are constitutional questions involved. The outcome will affect all future vending appeals involving financial damage and lost income.

The National Federation of the Blind has carried this case from the beginning, and we will see it through to the end. How can any blind vendor fail to recognize the implications and the consequences?

Dave Shell: We have participated in an arbitration on behalf of Dave Shell, a blind vendor who operated a facility in Reno, Nevada. The decision of the three-member arbitration panel (incidentally, it was a split decision) was unfavorable to us. As you will remember from my report last year, Dave Shell was unfairly removed from his vending facility on the grounds that he was uncooper-

ative, that he would not permit an audit of his books. The state agency failed to mention that it had already audited him four or five times during a twelve-month period and that there was written evidence that the state director was out to get him. I am sure that I don't have to tell you that we have filed an appeal in the federal court. There should be a limit as to how much control any state agency can have over the life of a citizen.

Ruth McGarity: This case involved refusal by the state agency for the blind in Rhode Island to issue a vending license. Mrs. McGarity is an active Federationist and President of our Blind Merchants Chapter in Rhode Island. She has been a vendor for many years. The state refused to give her a license to operate the vending facility to which she had lawfully been promoted. This meant she worked for approximately a year as a temporary manager, receiving only the minimum wage. The agency's excuse was that another vendor (backed by the American Council of the Blind) was appealing the promotion. We argued that the state was violating its own rules and that Mrs. McGarity was entitled to a license regardless of the appeal. We further argued that she was entitled to the net proceeds of the business from the time of the beginning of her operation of it. We made it clear we would appeal. Today Ruth McGarity has her license, and she also has all of the money she earned.

Lester Davenport: We discussed this case last year, and there have been further developments. Lester Davenport was a blind vendor at a facility owned by the Tennessee Valley Authority. There were problems in dealing with TVA

management, and the Tennessee state agency for the blind did nothing to help. In fact, the agency failed to come to Lester's defense when it appeared that TVA was violating the federal Randolph-Sheppard Act. Instead, the agency helped TVA. It revoked Lester's license and removed him from the vending program altogether. We are in the midst of arbitration, and there will be additional hearings. Ralph Sanders is serving on the arbitration panel. We intend to win this case and to see to it that Lester Davenport is once more employed as a licensed vendor in the Tennessee program.

Pennsylvania: We are about to go to federal arbitration in a case involving promotional opportunities for blind vendors in Pennsylvania. Richard Kreamer, Abraham Brotman, and Lillian Wyer were all denied promotions to which they were entitled. The promotions were denied because of the way the state was interpreting a veteran's preference clause in the Pennsylvania regulations. The state said that a veteran (eligible for a vending facility or not) should be placed as a vendor over other blind persons eligible for the assignment. The vendors in the state disagree. Marc Maurer is representing the vendors in this arbitration. Ralph Sanders will serve on the arbitration panel.

George McNab: George McNab is a blind vendor in Arkansas. We are about to have a federal arbitration in a grievance filed against the state agency. Jim Gashel will serve on the arbitration panel. The issue involves a promotion which Mr. McNab was denied at the time when Lou Rives was the head of the state agency and also President of the National Accreditation Council for Agencies



Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped (NAC). Mr. McNab should have received the promotion according to the state regulations, but Lou Rives ruled against him. We will see the case through to the end.

Iowa Commission for the Blind: For twenty years we made a model of the Iowa Commission for the Blind. We made it a program of which to be proud. Late in 1982 the board of that agency hired as Director Nancy Norman, the wife of the board chairman's law partner. We said that Mrs. Norman understood neither blindness nor the Commission's programs, her only qualification being that she had worked for the state in a computer operation and that her husband was the law partner of the chairman of the board. Now, her actions are giving proof to what we said.

The latest controversy involving the Iowa Commission for the Blind concerns two new rules, one applying to blind college students and the other to blind vendors. The first would end the policy which we had allowing blind students to attend colleges and universities of their own choice. The new rule provides that the Commission will only pay full tuition for students attending state supported schools in Iowa. If the student elects to attend a private college or university or a school outside of the state, tuition will be covered only in an amount equal to what it would have cost in a state institution. There is virtual unanimity among the blind of Iowa in opposing this policy.

The second rule would permit the Iowa Commission for the Blind to remove vendors from their facilities at the Commission's discretion without a hearing. The hearing would come later. I believe

this rule violates the federal Randolph-Sheppard Act.

In mid-June a hearing on these two proposed rules was held before a committee of the Iowa Legislature. We had relatively short notice and were compelled to act in a hurry. I sent Jim Gashel to Iowa. He worked with Peggy Pinder, Joe Van Lent, and other leaders of our Iowa affiliate. He and Joe drew up a petition opposing the vending rule, and Jim chartered a small private plane and covered the state in a day and a half to get signatures from vendors to build support. (Incidentally that, too, is how our money is spent.) By the time of the hearing we had the signatures of more than half of the vendors in the state. The only vendor to speak in favor of the rule was Sylvester Nemmers. Jim Gashel testified against both rules and also talked with members of the Governor's staff. The final outcome is still uncertain, but it is likely that at least some changes will be made.

There is hardly time even to mention all of the cases with which we are dealing. Fred Stout is a blind person. He is one of our members. He lives in the suburbs of Washington, D. C. He applied for a job as Director of the Office for the Handicapped of Montgomery County, Maryland. His application was not even considered. He was denied an interview. The interviewer said that there was no point to it since Fred obviously could not do the job. Then, the County hired a deaf person for the position and argued that this proved they did not discriminate against Fred Stout. After all, they had hired a handicapped person. A suit has been filed in the federal district court. We are doing what we can to help win it.

Catherine Gaffney was removed from her clerical job at the American Insulated Wire Corporation in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, on May 6 of this year. Appeals are now pending before the Rhode Island Human Rights Agency and the United States Department of Labor. The company's excuse for the termination is that Catherine, being blind, cannot do other work and that someone in the office had to go. But they overlooked her seniority and her ability to do that other work. Also ignored was Catherine's capacity for training in professional jobs available at the company. We will help her get her job back, as well as the pay she illegally lost.

Donna Yates: Last year I reported to you on this case. Here is what I said: "Donna Yates is a Federation member from Rhode Island. When she wanted to take a cruise on the Costa Cruise Line, she was turned down because of blindness and the fact that she would not be accompanied by a sighted person. She is appealing—and we are helping her. The case is now before the New York State Human Rights Commission. This is a clear-cut violation of New York law, and we intend to prevail."

That's what I said last year. Well, we did prevail. The case was settled last fall. The cruise line apologized, gave Donna a half-price rate on a future cruise, and said it would not discriminate against the blind again. Is it any wonder that people get mad at us? We keep our promises, and we win our fights.

Donna Maglin: This case involves the issue of whether a blind person can run power woodworking tools. It was raised when the Concord, New Hampshire, Union School District refused to admit Donna

Maglin (one of our New Hampshire leaders) to an adult education class. School officials said that Donna (at her own expense) must provide an aid to be at her side constantly. They said it was a matter of safety. Then, it developed that Paul Carver (the President of our local chapter—blind, of course) is an accomplished woodworker. So we concluded that he would make an excellent aid. The school officials cried foul. They said they had meant a sighted aid. So now we are dealing with two cases of discrimination—one against Donna Maglin and one against Paul Carver. A civil rights complaint is pending before the United States Department of Education. We will pursue it, and we intend to prevail.

Hazel Staley: This leader of our North Carolina affiliate and former national board member is well-known to all of us. Earlier this year she went with a group from her church to visit the Cannon Mills plant in Kanapolis, North Carolina. It was a scheduled public tour. But when Hazel arrived with the group, she was told she couldn't take the tour. She was required to sit in the waiting room until the others had finished. We have been working with Hazel and a lawyer to try to resolve the matter. The company has written what they call an apology and has invited Hazel back for a public tour any time she wants one, but (so far) they have declined to say that any blind person who comes may tour on the same basis as others.

Rebecca Norcross: We have just begun working on this case. Rebecca Norcross is a qualified school librarian. She applied for an available position in the public schools of Flippin, Arkansas.

Although there is strong evidence that she was the best qualified candidate, she was not hired. She was certainly better qualified than the person who got the job. Administrative appeals were first filed. Now, a lawsuit is underway. We are doing everything we can to help win it. The trial is set for this summer, and we will provide expert witnesses.

Mike Hingson: In 1981, as Federationists know, Mike Hingson filed suit against Pacific Southwest Airlines (PSA). Mike was publicly abused and humiliated and finally physically removed from the plane because he refused to sit in segregated seating. The details have appeared in the Monitor. This spring there was a trial. We lost. We are appealing. Our appeal is based on a number of factors: The judge refused to admit as evidence the testimony of a consultant to PSA who had said in a deposition that the airline did commit violations, including violations of its own procedures. The witness was not allowed to testify. We have found a number of other errors, so it is on with the battle.

We are involved in another airline case. As most of you know, we have instituted a lawsuit on behalf of Diane McGeorge against Continental Airlines. The case arose a few months ago when a Continental flight crew refused to allow Diane to sit in the seat to which she had been assigned. They called the police, physically removed her from the plane, kept her under surveillance without her knowledge, misrepresented the regulations to her, and publicly subjected her to verbal abuse. The policeman involved said that Diane had not broken any law and that he was simply

trying to accommodate the captain. The suit filed in the federal district court for the District of Columbia seeks upwards of a million dollars in damages.

Lola Pace and Roger Smart: We have talked about this in the past. The case continues. It involves two blind people (Lola Pace and Roger Smart) who worked for a federal contractor in Texas. Roger and Lola were the only blind employees. Two years ago they lost their jobs as x-ray technicians, developing films in a darkroom. The company claimed that changes had to be made in the work force. The only changes were the dismissal of the blind employees. In fact, a company official said in writing that they would have been kept if they had been sighted. We have helped with an unsuccessful administrative appeal to the Department of Labor. We are now going to appeal to the courts, and we intend to pursue the matter to victory.

Hilda Long lives in West Virginia. When she attempted to do student teaching under the teacher preparation program at Glenville State College, an effort was made to force her to do student teaching at the West Virginia School for the Blind. They felt that Hilda (being blind) did not belong in a public school classroom. We protested. Dick Porter, Jim Gashel, and others led the fight. Our West Virginia affiliate is strong and well-connected politically. We enlisted the aid of the Governor's Affirmative Action Officer. Hilda was accepted into the regular student teaching program, and she was successful. She was certified late last summer and has just completed her first year of employment as a substitute teacher (grades 2 to 6) at the Lincoln Park

Elementary School in Parkersburg, West Virginia. School officials say they are entirely happy with her work.

There are others: We are working on a Social Security case with Linda Miller, and we are helping Paul Flynn—a blind teacher in Baltimore, who has taught for twenty years at the same school and was dismissed this year on the grounds of blindness by a new administrator.

Jane Kessinger lives in a small community not far from Columbus, Ohio. She is blind and her husband is sighted. They have a natural child (a daughter), who is six years old. For three years they have also cared for another child. This child is three and a half. Recently the Kessingers sought to adopt this child, and a social worker from a local agency visited their home. Do I need to tell you the rest? One official in the Social Services Department is quoted as having said: "I just couldn't sleep at night thinking that we might have assigned a child to the care of a blind person." The child was taken from the Kessingers. If this was justified, one wonders why they let the Kessingers keep their six-year-old. There was a hearing in early June. We are working with legal counsel. Bob Eschbach, who holds a master's degree in social work, is giving particular attention to the matter. We intend to win this case. Incidentally, it was the state rehabilitation agency which originally sought our help by calling the National Office. Of course, there is nothing improper about that. After all, when others can't fight for the rights of the blind, we can—and we do.

Shirley Wickenberg is a blind medical transcriber in California. She has two small children. On November 10, 1982,

Mrs. Wickenberg left her children at the home of a babysitter, who was sighted. One of the children sustained minor injuries while playing. A social worker got involved. Both children were taken from Mrs. Wickenberg. Never mind that she was not the one caring for them at the time of the mishap and that the babysitter was sighted. Spearheaded by Sharon Gold, the Federation went into action. Incidentally, we were the only ones who did go into action.

On November 17 the court said the children could be returned to Mrs. Wickenberg if (and only if) she would provide 24-hour-a-day supervision of the children by a sighted person. We went to the media and got publicity, and we continued to work through legal counsel. We got action. Only three days after the order the judge was seeking a conference with us. On Thanksgiving Day the children were reunited with their mother. Then, the in-home sighted supervision requirement was dropped. A number of our people who are familiar with child care (both Californians and others) filed statements with the court. I know you will share my joy that on March 18, 1983, we achieved total victory. The court terminated its jurisdiction over the Wickenberg children. Is there any other answer needed as to why we have a National Federation of the Blind?

These are not all of the cases, but they constitute a representative sample of the past year's work. They show what can be done with an extremely small staff; a relatively limited budget; and a tremendous amount of dedication, determination, and volunteer labor. And, of course, we have done other things. Last year we were fighting with Frontier



Airlines about their treatment of blind passengers (including the negative Braille brochures they were passing out). This year Frontier replaced their negative brochure with a new one, which they publicly said was developed in cooperation with us; and we worked with them to make a training film for their employees. We have had success in dealing with a number of other airlines. We have continued to help the blind of other countries—particularly, the blind of Ecuador.

We have expanded the distribution of our magazine, the Braille Monitor. It now goes to every congressional office and to every agency doing work with the blind in the country. It is beyond question the most influential publication in the field today.

During the past year we have sent out from the National Office more than 500,000 print, Braille, and recorded items. This is in addition to the Monitor and to the JOB publications. We have also provided at very low prices talking clocks, talking calculators, and other aids and appliances.

When you look back over the past twelve months, you have to feel joy and satisfaction at what we have accomplished. What an absolutely wonderful year we have had! There have been attacks upon us and problems to solve and difficulties to surmount, but none of it matters when you think of our achievements. Many of you knew Dr. tenBroek. Think how pleased he would be if he could stand here today and take the measure of the movement he founded. We have kept the faith and lived the dream and fulfilled the promise.

I want to conclude by renewing with you our pledge and commitment to each other. I have said to you before (and I now repeat) that there is a bond of understanding between the members of this organization and the President—between you and me. You expect me to stand forth on the cutting edge of progress and do what has to be done to lead the movement. You expect me to be in the thick of the battle and not to shrink from unpleasant tasks. You expect me to meet attacks and not compromise our principles. All of this I am prepared to do to the best of my ability. As long as you choose to have me as your President, I will lead as wisely, as firmly, and as lovingly as I know how to lead. And make no mistake: As long as I am President, I intend to lead. I believe you would as quickly dismiss me for failure to act as you would for acting unwisely—and I think you would be right. This is what I believe you expect from me, and I gladly give it, without reservation and to the best of my ability.

In turn, you have a duty to me, and to the movement. If I am to stand in the front of the battle and take whatever comes in the way of personal abuse and attack, I need (indeed, I must have) your support, your encouragement, and (yes) your love and understanding. Together we have built a mighty movement, and together we shall go on to equality and first-class status for all of the blind. This is our mutual bond, our pledge of commitment to each other and ourselves. This is the National Federation of the Blind.

## BLEECKER LEAVES NAC AMIDST CONTROVERSY

### SAYS HE THINKS IT'S TIME FOR HIM TO PLAY IN ANOTHER SANDBOX

The afternoon of Saturday, November 10, 1979, was sleepy and relaxed. Football games were in progress, and the world seemed at peace. A day in autumn—backyard barbecues, picnics, perhaps a stroll in the park.

But in a hotel in Oklahoma City the atmosphere was different. A course of action was being formulated and plans were being made for nothing less than the destruction of the organized blind movement, the National Federation of the Blind. It was a meeting of NAC (the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped). The meeting had been preceded by closed-door sessions, and there was an atmosphere of expectancy.

When Dick Johnstone (the President of the Board of the Minneapolis Society for the Blind) rose to speak, he made it clear that a new political alliance was to be attempted and that Richard Bleecker (NAC's Executive Director) was to be the king pin of it all. The tactics to be used would be pressure, political action, toughness, money spent where it was needed, and whatever else might be required to accomplish the objective—and there was no question as to what the objective was to be. Johnstone said in part: "...I'm proud of every one of you, especially Dr. Bleecker and NAC for their deep, deep help...All NAC needs now is a few more teeth and the money to apply them. Money can come to NAC, the same way it was lost, with pressure...But also, uh, I'm sure NAC would

help any. . .assist any and all people in applying some pressure with letters...In the previous two or three years, Minneapolis Society for the Blind has gone around the country talking to people...Ninety percent of the time, uh, the advice given to us was to settle, negotiate. One voice from the wilderness cried out: 'Fight!' He's sitting right here, with the glasses, Dr. Bleecker. God bless him!...Dr. Bleecker has that authority right now, unlike other agencies who've had to fiddle around and go to their boards...NAC is prompt, very prompt in comparison to other groups, as I said. In helping us, NAC was number one, first on the scene. Help was just unbelievable! Anything we needed we got...Dr. Bleecker knows, the only thing the National Federation of the Blind respects is strength. The power is with us right now, if we will use our heads and use it...It's time we go on the offensive, quit hiding our heads in the sand...I would like to ask Dick Bleecker to come up here. This gentleman here has done more to help us as a society, as an agency, than I can ever repay. I just wanna shake his hand in front o' you people and thank him personally."

That is what Johnstone said, and it was in keeping with the tone of the rest of the NAC meeting. It was more like a political convention (or even the meeting of a paramilitary group) than the gathering of a deliberative body—an organization with the avowed purpose of setting standards of excellence for

services to blind people, weighing dispassionately the merits of various governmental and private agencies in the field, and impartially determining which group should be accredited and which should not. NAC was to use pressure tactics. It was to have teeth—and those teeth were meant to bite the very people it was purportedly established to serve, the blind.

The following morning (Sunday, November 11, 1979) was more of the same. The NAC board adopted what it called a "Policy Statement" concerning the National Federation of the Blind and its leaders. This so-called "Policy Statement" was obviously meant to be an instrument of war, calculated to create dissension in the NFB and to divide the leaders from the movement. The fact that it did not work is a commentary not on the intent but on the lack of ability of the NAC policy makers and leaders. The "Policy Statement" says in full:

---

#### POLICY STATEMENT

The National Accreditation Council (NAC) believes the present national leadership of the National Federation of the Blind (NFB) to be harmful to the welfare of blind and visually handicapped persons through its opposition to standards and accreditation.

Therefore:

NAC does not recognize the present national NFB leadership as a responsible influence in the provision of quality services;

NAC reaffirms its commitment to work

with all organizations and individuals—including members of NFB—who support quality services through standards and accreditation.

Approved unanimously at the annual meeting of the NAC Board of Directors, assembled November 11, 1979 in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

---

This is perhaps one of the strangest policy declarations ever made by a group claiming to act impartially in a quasi-judicial manner—that is, the setting of standards, the judging of the quality of services provided by different agencies and groups, and the giving or withholding of accreditation. Political in-fighting and power plays can have no part in any such process—at least, if that process is to be ethical, meaningful, or honest. Nevertheless, NAC seemed to be prepared to take the offensive. Dr. Bleecker was to be the General, but most people felt that the real authority and money would come from the American Foundation for the Blind. In fact, many felt that the real General was Bill Gallagher, the Foundation's Executive Director, and that Bleecker was simply a Lieutenant. Be this as it may, the plans were laid, and the grand alliance was proclaimed and set in motion.

That was almost four years ago, and the world has undergone many changes. The Federation engaged in so-called "peace talks" with the American Foundation for the Blind, and the Foundation and Mr. Gallagher found themselves exposed for all to see their nakedness. In desperation (after their delays

failed and they were finally forced to come to the meeting) they walked out, saving what face they could. Dr. Bleecker was caught red-handed trying to get the United States Department of Labor to cut off funds to continue the program of Job Opportunities for the Blind; and Dr. Otis Stephens, NAC's President, and Mr. Gallagher had no better excuse than that they did not know Dr. Bleecker was doing it and that it certainly would not happen again. The attempted investigation of the National Federation of the Blind in Iowa backfired and blew up. The federal auditors and the Federal Bureau of Investigation thoroughly examined Federation records and said there were no violations. The Federation printed and widely circulated the letters from the federal officials to prove it. The NAC-AFB grand alliance tried to stop blind workers in the sheltered shops from organizing, and they were beaten—both in the federal courts and before the National Labor Relations Board. The attempts to cause dissension within the National Federation of the Blind fizzled out, and the Federation (with its new chartering system firmly in place) has now been victorious on all fronts and is stronger than it has ever been. Despite the efforts to block them, Congressional hearings concerning the propriety of political action, subminimum wage policies, and other questionable practices of the sheltered shops were held this spring and widely publicized. The attempt by NAC to achieve endorsement by the National Council of State Agencies for the Blind failed earlier this year, and a number of powerful agencies began to reconsider the desirability of continued accreditation with NAC. Finally, the Commission on Accreditation of Reha-

bilitation Facilities began to move into the field, announcing that it would accredit agencies doing work with the blind and, indeed, accredit the Cleveland Society for the Blind. The decline of NAC's fortunes simply could not any longer be explained away or shrugged off.

Seen from this perspective the departure of Bleecker was inevitable. Of course, it was done in NAC's usual way. He was not officially "fired." Dr. Stephens said so. He was allowed to resign. In fact, a letter from Bleecker to Stephens was widely circulated:

---

New York, New York  
June 20, 1983

Dear Dr. Stephens:

This letter confirms my decision to resign my position as executive director of the National Accreditation Council. As we discussed last weekend, I agree to serve through our Annual Meeting to assist in a smooth transition.

Last February I celebrated my tenth anniversary with NAC. It has been a wonderful decade: I have loved my work, been stimulated by the challenges it offered, and been richly rewarded through many friendships and experiences.

NAC's mission is vital to the attainment by this field of greater effectiveness and accountability. What remains is to assure NAC's permanence through achievement of financial independence, and to strengthen its professional authority by linking tangible incentives and benefits to accreditation. Movement



toward these goals is well underway, and I believe that their attainment is inevitable. I remain firmly convinced that NAC will play an ever greater role in assuring quality services to blind and visually handicapped people, by helping a troubled field to survive.

I wish to thank you and each of the more than one hundred NAC directors whom it has been my privilege to serve during my tenure. I also want to acknowledge the competence, dedication and courage of the agencies and schools that have distinguished themselves through achievement of accreditation. And I reserve my highest gratitude for the NAC staff, without whose unflinching support our progress would not have been possible.

I close with all good wishes to you and everyone associated with NAC.

Very truly yours,  
Richard W. Bleecker

---

Dr. Stephens made the appropriate response. His memo to the NAC Board put the best possible face on things and talked of the great work which Bleecker had done. Except for the inconsistencies and the disparity between what was said and what has actually occurred, no fault can be found with it:

---

DATE: June 22, 1983  
TO: Board of Directors  
FROM: Otis H. Stephens  
SUBJECT: Transition in Executive  
Leadership

On Friday, June 17, 1983, Dr. Richard W. Bleecker informed the Executive Committee of his decision to resign as Executive Director of the National Accreditation Council, effective at the close of the annual meeting in November. With deepest regret, the Committee accepted Dr. Bleecker's resignation. A copy of his formal letter of resignation is enclosed.

Dr. Bleecker has completed more than a decade of exceptionally distinguished service to the National Accreditation Council. He joined the staff as Associate Director in 1973 and was appointed Executive Director in January, 1975. He has held a position of leadership in our organization during more than half of its history.

This has been a critical period in NAC's growth—a period characterized by adversity no less than by opportunity. But thanks chiefly to Richard Bleecker's strong leadership and total professional commitment, NAC has more than met the challenge. The number of accredited agencies and schools has doubled. Active support from professionals, consumers, and the general public is much greater now than ever before. The practical value of accreditation to blind persons and the agencies serving them is now widely acknowledged. Consumer involvement in NAC has steadily increased. The high quality of NAC's standard-setting and accreditation activities is now widely recognized within the accreditation community. This recognition also is more widespread today both within and outside the field, than at any time in the past.

Not only has Dr. Bleecker contributed immeasurably to each of these accomplishments, but he has also played a key

role in the realization of many other important achievements as well. Among the most noteworthy of these are: two renewals for the maximum period of NAC's formal recognition as the authoritative accrediting body for specialized schools serving blind children by the Secretary of the United States Department of Education; the completion of comprehensive and highly favorable federal level reviews of NAC's work by the General Accounting Office and the Rehabilitation Services Administration; and the recognition that NAC is in full compliance with the standards for fund raising practices and internal management established for non-profit organizations by the National Information Bureau and the Council of Better Business Bureaus.

At its recent meeting in Atlanta the Executive Committee reviewed this impressive record of achievement and enthusiastically commended Dr. Bleecker for his outstanding contributions of leadership and service to NAC. The Committee also complimented Dr. Bleecker on his exceptional skill in the sound fiscal management and administration of our organization. This accomplishment is particularly significant in view of the fact that the size of the six-member professional staff has not changed in ten years and that NAC has continually operated within severe financial constraints.

Recognizing the importance of the position that Dr. Bleecker has occupied since 1975, the Executive Committee has decided to conduct a national search process leading to the appointment of his successor. Further details regarding the recruitment and selection process will be provided to you shortly.

---

One of the reasons for Bleecker's departure might have been seen in the increased attendance and dynamic vigor at the Convention of the National Federation of the Blind in Kansas City during the first week of July. It was a Convention of joy and optimism, one that the NAC supporters must have found discouraging and depressing. At the conclusion of the Convention the Monitor sent its reporters to interview agency leaders and NAC board members throughout the country. What did Bleecker's leaving mean? Was he, as some claimed, fired? Did he, as others insisted, resign of his own free will? Was he forced out? How did the agency leaders see the future for NAC? Was a true "national search" to be made for a successor, or had the new director already been picked, making of the "national search" just one more NAC maneuver? Was Carl Augusto, as some claimed, already hired, regardless of technicalities? These were the questions which Monitor reporters determined to get answered. The following notes give the substance of some of the interviews conducted:

#### INTERVIEW WITH DR. BLEECKER

James Gashel (Director of Governmental Affairs for the National Federation of the Blind) reached Dr. Bleecker by telephone early on the morning of July 13 at the convention of the American Association of Workers for the Blind in Phoenix. Bleecker denied reports that he was forced to resign. However, he admitted that the decision to resign had come after "consultation" with the NAC

---

Executive Committee. There was a clear implication that NAC leaders had "input" concerning the decision that Bleecker should resign at this time. Bleecker said he had begun to think of leaving NAC after serving eight years and that he had discussed a resignation with others. He said that between the eighth and the tenth year (1981 - 1983) he had entered a period of "intense introspection" and that from this his resignation had stemmed. He said he had no future plans.

In a follow-up telephone interview Mr. Gashel reached Dr. Bleecker at his New York office July 22. Bleecker said that his future plans were uncertain at the time of the announcement of his resignation and that they were still uncertain. Asked on July 22 for his "candid comments" on why he resigned, Dr. Bleecker said, "I guess I am a builder. I spent ten years in my last job, and a little over ten years at NAC; and now, it's time to play in another sandbox." These comments take on special significance when it is realized that Dr. Bleecker was only 43 years old at the time of his "resignation," having been born July 26, 1939.

Concerning the process for the selection of his successor Bleecker said this would be up to the NAC board and that he had offered his services in helping make the choice. He admitted that he had no direct role in the decision on a successor and had no idea whether he would be given an indirect role. He said that a "national search" would be made for the best qualified person. He expressed doubt that someone closely associated with NFB could (regardless of qualifications) be appointed. Bleecker characterized himself as a "professional

standard-setter and accreditor" who was forced to deal with attacks. He said his attack on the Job Opportunities for the Blind program and his activities in the proxy election at the Minneapolis Society for the Blind were not "political," just "organizational self-defense." He said that perhaps his greatest achievement was in getting the "Policy Statement" concerning the NFB and its leaders adopted. He said that perhaps his greatest disappointment was that the field had not shown the courage in tying funding to accreditation so as to give more "incentives" to agencies to accredit. He said that (although NAC had shown some growth) that he had been disappointed that the growth of NAC had been so "sluggish." He attributed this "sluggishness" to lack of "incentives"—the unwillingness of the field to make people accredit or cut off their money.

He said he was pleased that NAC was operating in the black, but he later admitted that funding was a problem for NAC. He said he was especially concerned with the continued dependence by NAC on funding from the American Foundation for the Blind and that he felt a way should be found to overcome this relationship. He thought this would be in the best interest of both the American Foundation and NAC because it subjects the Foundation to criticism and questions from potential donors. He denied there was a disagreement between him and Foundation officials over this issue. In his words there was "no rift."

Regarding accreditation of agencies and schools for the blind by CARF (the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities), Bleecker said he could understand how people might specu-

late that his resignation was somehow related to CARF's willingness to review for accreditation the same agencies that NAC could accredit. He said CARF was "unable and unqualified" to accredit programs serving the blind, but he views CARF's activities as "a very real threat to NAC."

#### INTERVIEW WITH RAY KEMPF

Jim Gashel reached Ray Kempf at his home in Minneapolis by telephone Wednesday, July 13. Kempf is a former NAC board member and a member of the American Council of the Blind.

He said Bleecker's departure could be an opportunity to end the NAC controversy, but that it was up to NFB to take advantage of the situation. Kempf said that NAC's real problem was the funding from the American Foundation for the Blind. He said he knew this because he has experience on NAC's funding committee. He said the Foundation would exercise control over NAC because of the funding. He said that AFB, not NAC, would choose the next executive director—or, at the very least, would have veto power. He said Bleecker was tired of being dominated by the Foundation and dissatisfied that the Foundation would not let go.

On the matter of relationships between organizations, Kempf said that Bleecker was not flexible enough—not a good negotiator. Otis Stephens, he said, is a good negotiator. He said it was possible there was a clash between Bleecker and Stephens over strategy for dealing with other organizations, but he would not be more specific. Complaining that

the Foundation dominates NAC, Kempf said that a peace initiative should be tried again, this time excluding Gallagher and the Foundation entirely. He said Gallagher was the problem in the last attempt.

#### INTERVIEW WITH DR. ROBERT WINN

Dr. Robert Winn is the Executive Director of the Hadley School for the Blind and the former head of the Division for the Blind in the federal Rehabilitation Services Administration. Jim Gashel reached Dr. Winn by telephone at the AAWB convention in Phoenix Wednesday, July 13.

Dr. Winn said he had several professional disagreements with Dr. Bleecker, but he said he did not want to throw stones at a man on his way out. He said that Dr. Bleecker did not adequately assure that NAC's on-sight review teams were professionally competent. He identified this as a primary responsibility of the Executive Director of NAC. He said that instead of professional considerations "politics may have played more of a part in the selection of the teams." He said that he himself had been asked to serve on a team for which he did not feel qualified and that politics had, he felt, been the deciding factor. He said that NAC should be less political. He said that the Hadley board had already been considering whether it would seek re-accreditation at the end of its current period and that the Hadley board is monitoring the situation with NAC. He further said that the choice of the new Executive Director would be a factor in Hadley's determina-



tion as to whether to continue with NAC in the future.

#### INTERVIEW WITH RUTH DANON

Ruth Danon has a Ph.D. degree. She is the office manager at NAC. Mr. Gashel reached her by telephone at the NAC office in New York July 13. She said there were no leading contenders for the NAC post and refused to comment as to whether Carl Augusto is the most likely successor. She would make no comment on the written statements by Bleecker or Stephens.

#### INTERVIEW WITH ROY KUMPE

Roy Kumpe (retired) is a former director of Arkansas Enterprises for the Blind and is generally recognized as one of the leaders in the field. He was reached by Mr. Gashel at the AAWB convention in Phoenix Wednesday, July 13. He said he thought Dr. Bleecker was simply "tired of the battle."

#### INTERVIEW WITH RICHARD SEIFERT

Mr. Gashel reached Mr. Seifert by telephone in his hotel room at the AAWB meeting in Phoenix Wednesday, July 13. Seifert is the successor to Louis Rives as head of the Arkansas Office for the Blind and Visually Impaired. He speculated that Bleecker was dissatisfied with the fact that the agencies had failed to promote NAC through agreeing to form a relationship between accreditation and funding. He saw this as one of the major objectives which Bleecker had and failed to accomplish. He believed that Bleecker was dissatisfied with the field for its lack of support

for NAC by not tying funding to accreditation. Seifert commented that perhaps Bleecker's successor should be someone not currently in work with the blind. He thought an outsider was needed, someone expert in accreditation.

#### INTERVIEW WITH GRANT MACK

Jim Gashel reached Grant Mack by telephone at his home in Salt Lake City, Utah, July 13. Mack is President of the American Council of the Blind and a NAC board member. He said NAC would be doing bigger and better things in the future. He defended Bleecker as an able administrator and said his greatest strength was "running the office." He said he was unwilling to mention any weaknesses Dr. Bleecker might have. He declined to comment on Dr. Bleecker's political activities and seemed to have no objection to it. He specifically refused to say whether he thought NAC should be involved in resisting labor unions in sheltered shops. When asked to be specific by NAC doing "bigger and better things," Mr. Mack simply meant "more effective." There seemed to be no specifics.

#### INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES FEGAN

Charles Fegan, Executive Director of the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind, Washington, D.C., was reached by telephone Thursday, July 14, in his office by Mr. Gashel. The Columbia Lighthouse is NAC accredited.

Mr. Fegan said emphatically that NAC should stick to standards and accreditation and leave politics alone. He gave as an example of objectionable activity Dr. Bleecker's visit to the Department

of Labor to try to destroy the Job Opportunities for the Blind program at the very time NAC was engaging in "peace talks" with the National Federation of the Blind. Mr. Fegan said that he did not know Dr. Bleecker very well and that he was unaware of the reasons for what he termed his "early retirement." He hoped NAC would have a "new direction" (less political) under a new executive director. He said this would be a factor in his decision as to whether to renew with NAC in 1986.

#### INTERVIEW WITH CLEO DOLAN

Mr. Gashel reached Cleo Dolan by telephone at the Cleveland Society for the Blind Thursday, July 14. Dolan is Executive Director of the Society and a former NAC stalwart. Mr. Dolan said that (although he was aware of the resignation) he had not had contact with Dr. Bleecker for some time. Dolan complained that the NAC review teams were not professional. He said "NAC doesn't have enough accreditation each year to keep abreast of trends in the field." He said he did not know the reasons for the resignation of Dr. Bleecker, which he specifically referred to as an "early retirement."

#### INTERVIEW WITH CARL AUGUSTO

Mr. Gashel reached Mr. Augusto by telephone Wednesday, July 13, at the AAWB meeting in Phoenix. He would not comment on the causes for the Bleecker resignation nor would he comment on speculation that he might be in line for the job. He answered "no comment" to a series of questions, and finally he said his answer to any question about NAC,

Dr. Bleecker, his own future, or anything else would be "no comment." He acted very much like a candidate.

#### INTERVIEW WITH MELVIN SATERBACK

Mr. Saterback was reached by telephone at his office at the Minneapolis Society for the Blind July 14 by Mr. Gashel. At that time he was Executive Director. He has since been "separated from the service." The same questions that have been asked concerning Bleecker have been asked concerning Saterback. Was he fired? Did he quit voluntarily? If so, why? Is the whole NAC combine beginning to crumble?

Be this as it may, Mr. Saterback characterized the cause of Dr. Bleecker's resignation as "burnout." When asked whether the selection of a new executive director for NAC would be a factor in MSB's continued affiliation, Mr. Saterback said MSB will stay with NAC regardless of who is chosen. In the circumstances perhaps Mr. Saterback's opinions have less relevance than some of the others who are listed here.

#### INTERVIEW WITH WILLIAM GALLAGHER

Jim Gashel reached Bill Gallagher by telephone at the AAWB meeting in Phoenix July 13. Gallagher, of course, is the Executive Director of the American Foundation for the Blind and is regarded by many as the behind-the-scenes manipulator of the AFB-NAC-ACB-ALL combine. He responded to most questions by referring to Dick Bleecker's letter of resignation and seemed uncomfortable going beyond it. He said he was "sorry to see Dr. Bleecker go." He thought Dr. Bleecker had been an asset to the field. He

did not know what Dr. Bleecker's future plans might be and had not discussed with him a job at the Foundation. Mr. Gallagher acknowledged that NAC had financial difficulties but said, "who couldn't use more money?" He said that the Foundation would continue its support for NAC and that there would be a "nationwide search" for a new director.

#### INTERVIEW WITH GEORGE JACOBSON

Mr. Gashel reached Mr. Jacobson at his office in Seattle by telephone Thursday, July 14. Mr. Jacobson is Executive Director of the Seattle Lighthouse for the Blind and President of the General Council of Workshops for the Blind. Mr. Jacobson said he knew very little about Dr. Bleecker and nothing of the reasons for his resignation. He said workshops are not much aware of NAC or of what he termed "its values"—particularly, the self-study. Mr. Jacobson said that workshops had not responded significantly by permitting National Industries for the Blind to pay their costs of accreditation if they would consent to join NAC.

#### INTERVIEW WITH DR. OTIS STEPHENS

Jim Gashel reached Otis Stephens by telephone at his office in Knoxville, Tennessee, July 13. Stephens is the President of NAC and the First Vice President of the American Council of the Blind. Stephens maintained the position that Bleecker had made a personal decision to resign. Asked whether he thought the Bleecker resignation represented any change in direction or approach to the blind by NAC, Dr. Stephens said, "it is too early to tell." Ste-

phens said that NAC's Executive Director should stick to standards and accreditation and leave politics alone. He said that Bleecker's removal from the scene might diminish personality conflicts and help in working out philosophical differences, especially between NAC and NEB. He said he hoped we would write a "positive article" so as not to aggravate tensions further. He implied that we should remain hopeful that the change would mean a new direction (at least, diminishing NAC's political role). He said he hoped we would view this as an opportunity to improve relations.

#### INTERVIEW WITH MILTON SAMUELSON

Rami Rabby reached Mr. Samuelson at his office in Chicago. Mr. Samuelson is the head of the Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind. He refused to answer questions on the telephone. He said it was their policy only to answer questions submitted in writing. Apparently the Chicago Lighthouse is about the same as it has always been.

#### INTERVIEW WITH DELBERT AMAN

Rami Rabby reached Delbert Aman by telephone at his office in South Dakota. Aman is employed by the South Dakota state agency for the blind, is a NAC board member, and is a member of NAC's Commission on Accreditation. Aman said that Bleecker was a hard worker, committed to the concept of accreditation and to NAC as the accreditation agency. However, he said: "His closeness to NAC" tended to "cloud his perspectives" as far as any criticism of NAC was concerned. Aman said that Bleecker took criticism very badly, almost personally.

In response to the question as to what NAC might do differently in the future, Aman said that NAC needs to "take less public note of criticism." He said that NAC would do better to listen with an open ear to criticism, be more positive about it, and be introspective; it should try to improve its operation rather than be so defensive.

#### INTERVIEW WITH WILLIAM COPPAGE

Mr. Gashel reached Mr. Coppage by telephone at the AAWB convention in Phoenix July 13. Mr. Coppage is Executive Director of the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped. He is immediate past president of AAWB and a former NAC executive committee and board member of long standing.

Coppage first made the general observation that he was "very surprised" by the Bleecker resignation. He said that there was no question that Dr. Bleecker had his critics, and he speculated that personality clashes were involved and may have been related to the resignation. He declined to name the critics or to state the source of the personality clashes. He said people regarded "Dick" as "too formal and stiff." Coppage volunteered that some still resented Bleecker's involvement in the disruption of the National Council of State Agencies for the Blind during the 1970's. He said Bleecker was seen as the "prime mover" and was still carrying that political baggage around. With respect to a successor, he said he was not interested in the job and would not be applying. He said he had heard the name of Carl Augusto being mentioned. He said his NAC accredited agency, the

Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped, would be watching with interest the new appointee. He said he wanted to see someone in the job who would stick more strictly to the business of standards and accreditation. The new executive director should not be a political figure. Coppage said he hoped for a new direction at NAC, and his agency would evaluate the new executive director in deciding whether to continue as an accredited member in the future.

#### INTERVIEW WITH E. LYMAN D'ANDREA

Mr. Gashel reached Mr. D'Andrea by telephone at his office in Providence, Rhode Island, Wednesday, July 13. Mr. D'Andrea is the administrator of Rhode Island State Services for the Visually Impaired. The agency is NAC accredited. Mr. D'Andrea believed that Dr. Bleecker was forced to resign but did not know why. He did not question that Bleecker was "pressured out." He said that Bleecker had not been "tough enough" on agencies which violated NAC standards. He complained that if his agency was expected to follow the rules, everyone else should be held to an equal standard of compliance. He said they were not. He differed with Dr. Bleecker on the point of having a relationship between funding of state agencies and accreditation. He said standards should remain voluntary. He said he understood that Bleecker wanted the National Council of State Agencies for the Blind to endorse accreditation for state agencies, but he (D'Andrea) was opposed to that. He hopes the next executive director will stick to standards, not politics.



## CONCLUSIONS

From this wide sample of interviews and from the fact that Dr. Bleecker is only now 44 years old (43 when he resigned), it seems clear that his resignation was not totally voluntary. In fact, when one considers that he apparently has no job to go to (even assuming that he will subsequently get one), it stretches credulity to believe anything other than that he was simply fired. He left NAC in a weaker position than he found it: When he came, NAC was receiving almost half of its funding from the federal Rehabilitation Services Administration. It now receives none. When he came, there was much hope that NAC could find enough sources of other funding to diminish its dependence upon the money of the Foundation. Today Foundation funding and control are a way of life for NAC, and no one seriously expects the future to bring changes. At the beginning of the Bleecker administration there was confident talk of having a hundred agencies accredited within a year. It is now ten years later, and the magic hundred mark has never been reached, and probably never will be. It was during the Bleecker administration that agencies such as the Massachusetts Association for the Blind defected and others (notably the Cleveland Society for the Blind) were lost. Before the Bleecker era, no agency had first been accredited and then withdrawn from NAC. Above all, the Bleecker administration saw NAC bogged down in politics and a preoccupation with survival for survival's sake—nothing new, nothing positive, and nothing to hope for: an organization beleaguered and a dream forgotten.

As for Dick Bleecker, the times have simply passed him by. He is only 44, but as one of those who were interviewed said, "he is burned out." His creativity (such as it was), his public notice, and his ability to play a part in the world of people and things will probably never again be what it was. The road of the future would seem to be down—which, in many ways, is unfortunate for Bleecker is not without ability; and at one time he had the potential to be a constructive force in the field instead of what he became.

If there is any hope at all for NAC, the first step had to be the removal of Bleecker. That step has now been taken. Of course, the NAC problem runs far deeper than Richard Bleecker. The American Foundation for the Blind and its wish to dominate all of the blind and all of the agencies in the field, Bill Gallagher and his will to power, the combination of agencies which still try to keep the blind down and who think they can do it by war and repression, the concentration of wealth and power in the sheltered shops and the behavior of the officials of those institutions—all of these are factors which tend to create problems and weaken the effectiveness of the agencies.

Even so, the departure of Dick Bleecker must be viewed as one of the most positive developments in work with the blind during the past decade. As to his pride in the "Policy Statement" which he developed concerning the NFB, we say this: As in so many other things, he misassesses. We would not want NAC to repeal it. It is, on the face of it, so unreasonable and out of touch with reality that it helps us do our work. It often shortcuts explanations. All we

have to do is show it to people to make our point.

As to Bleecker's successor, we could hardly hope for better than Carl Augusto. Bleecker was tough, mean, persistent, and moderately capable. Our observation would indicate that Augusto has the same intentions but lacks the qualities. Undoubtedly he will want to, but we think he can't. He may constitute far less of a problem than his predecessor.

Of course, it may not be Augusto. By the time Monitor readers receive this issue, the matter may have been settled.

In the best of all possible worlds NAC would appoint a mature individual with balanced perspective who would want to work with the blind instead of against us. So much damage has been done and so many problems have been created that it is hard to know whether (regardless of the ability or good intentions of the new director) NAC can be reformed. One almost wonders if it would not be easier, cleaner, and better to start over. As we said in the last issue, while the sun doesn't always rise on the same old dog, it frequently does.

## TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE: THE LAW AND THE ORGANIZED BLIND MOVEMENT

by Marc Maurer, Attorney At Law  
Delivered at the Annual Convention of the  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
Kansas City, Missouri, July 6, 1983

One of the most widespread criticisms of the law is that it is deadly dull. H. L. Mencken said, "One may think of the Supreme Court as a theater of dullness so heavy that the very cat's-paws drowse, and of imbecility so vast that even Congress is shamed and made to hang its head. Nevertheless, I have heard in that very chamber arguments that stimulated me like the bouquet of a fine Mosselle, or a smile of a princess of the blood, or an unexpected kick in the pantaloons." The law has its dull moments, but it also has passion, danger, and hope. In any law matter of consequence there will be uncertainty and fear.

Certainly that is true of the legal matters with which we deal. No one

knows how any particular case may come out. A negative precedent may be established which will cripple the prospects for blind people for decades to come. However, there is also the possibility of triumph. We proceed with the faith that a proper and thorough presentation of our case will show that logic and reason are the bedrock on which we make our complaint. We trust the promise that justice will not be denied. The truth will come out and be seen for what it is. The proof of ability will be more important than prejudice. The normality of blind people and the thirst of the blind for full and equal partnership in the grand experiment of life is far more important than man's ancient fear of the dark.

The statute books and the administrative codes do not speak of the crying, compelling need of the blind to be recognized as productive, able, intensely human creatures who must be woven into the mosaic which is our culture—but we do. The law contains the rules and judgments that gird us round. They can rein us in and hold us back, but they can also help to set us free. In large part it depends on what we do to shape this thing called law.

Almost a hundred years ago a band of enterprising entrepreneurs decided to put on a show, which would consist of a magnificent train wreck. Two engines faced each other from the crests of opposite hills. They were raced at full speed into the valley between. The showmen sold tickets to the great event. Printed on each ticket was the statement that the people running the show would not be responsible for any injuries to the spectators. Lemonade was sold, and everyone had a jolly good time—they did, that is, until the great moment.

The two engines collided. The steam boilers blew up. Red hot slivers of steel arced into the air and rained on the spectators, and hundreds of people were maimed or killed.

In the argument which followed, the showmen said that no person was authorized to be in the area unless he or she had a ticket. Each ticket was a contract. Each ticket specifically provided that the spectator, not the showmen, was responsible for all injuries. The showmen said that they could not be held liable for injuries to spectators.

Today (a hundred years later) no matter what the ticket said, the showmen could not escape responsibility. The law has changed. It would not permit

the avoidance of responsibility for such danger.

In 1980, only three years ago, Michael Hingson was ejected from a plane because he would not sit where airline officials had decided the blind should sit. He would not give up his right to full equality and first-class citizenship. He would not knuckle under to airline officials when they told him that he was second-rate. In 1980 the airline told Mike Hingson that there was a government regulation which required the airline to segregate him from the rest of the passengers. Mike Hingson (with his dog guide Holland) must sit in the first row of seats.

In 1983 the airline changed its story and said that it had insisted that Mike Hingson sit in the front seat because it would be safer. After all, they said, Mike would be closer to the door of the plane. It would be easier for airline personnel to help him get off if he were in the front seat. The National Federation of the Blind had filed a lawsuit in 1981 to protest this discriminatory treatment. Shortly thereafter, an airline official for the defendant, Pacific Southwest Airlines, said that the airline had made a mistake. This official testified under oath that the airline had violated its own policies in enforcing this segregation.

Nevertheless, a federal court would not permit us to present this evidence. The court ruled in favor of the airline. The judge said that if airline officials had safety matters in the back of their minds, they could present their concerns to the court. With such a ruling in hand airline officials, of course, remembered thinking of hundreds of ways in which the blind could be injured—caught

in a burning flame, maimed in the break-up of the aircraft, or otherwise dismembered or done-in.

Between 1980 and 1983 the airline had three years to remember all of the circumstances which could cause personal injury. Although the airline had never mentioned all of this to Mike Hingson, the memories of airline officials were graphic when called upon to describe air crashes. The fear of blindness was evident in the testimony of these officials. Because they did not know what they would do if they were blind, because they were afraid they would be helpless as blind people, because they are sure that they would be second class if they became blind, they insisted that we are second class.

The court ruled against us, but we are appealing. We cannot let it stand. We are reaching out for our dignity and our self-worth. They are trying to snatch those birthrights from us. And make no mistake, it is not just Mike Hingson or Pacific Southwest Airlines that is on trial—it is every one of us in this room: all of us—those here, those in the rest of the country, and those who are still children.

But the laws change. The National Federation of the Blind has been in existence for only a short time. Already a mighty labor has been accomplished. It is just the beginning, but what a beginning it is!

Back in 1940, when Dr. tenBroek brought the blind of seven states together to form the National Federation of the Blind, there was little legal protection for the blind. The Randolph-Sheppard Act had been passed, but very few vending stands were in operation. There was no Rehabilitation Act to pro-

vide services to the blind. There was no protection against discrimination. The Social Security Act had been adopted, which provided a little welfare money; but there was no Supplemental Security Income program and no Disability Insurance as we now know it. There was no right to work in the federal civil service, and no right to work for federal contractors. The Wagner-O'Day Act had been passed, but it did more for the workshop bosses than for us. It stimulated and expanded the sheltered workshop system, in which the blind have so often received less than the minimum wage. The books for the blind program had begun, and free mailing privileges for this program had been established. That was all. A few books; a little welfare; (perhaps, if you were very lucky) a vending stand.

By the mid-1960's Dr. tenBroek could argue that it was the policy of the nation that the blind be integrated into society as full and equal partners. Such an argument was a declaration of belief—belief in the capacity of the blind. Furthermore, it was a statement of faith that the courts would recognize that capacity, that society would understand it, and that understanding would bring acceptance. By the mid-1960's, we had gained the right to work in the civil service. There were many blind vendors, and Aid To The Blind programs had been liberalized so that there was at least some money available.

Many of the problems faced by the blind in the 1960's are foreign to us now. We never hear of them. They don't even stir our memories. The Kirschner case, for example. That landmark (tried in the 1960's) declared that the blind could not be denied Aid To The Blind



(now replaced by Supplemental Security Income) on the grounds that there might be relatives financially able to care for their needs. The Parrish case held that night raids against blind welfare recipients were an invasion of privacy and unconstitutional.

Today, these problems are so removed from our daily lives that they seem as fantastic as the old sumptuary laws, which decreed that there could be no more than two courses at a meal. They are as outmoded as the English statute which created trial by combat as one method for settling disputes. Before the Parrish case some governmental officials thought that night raids against Aid To The Blind recipients were reasonable. Today, that thought is outrageous. With time and effort the laws change.

In the early 1960's the raids involved Aid To The Blind recipients. In the 1980's the raids are different—and more ominous. The problem began with the question of whether blind persons are competent to adopt children. Some adoption agencies thought that blind parents could not raise children. Their requests to adopt children were denied. We fought this prejudice, and the adoption agencies backed down. But this was only the beginning. In several cases in recent years blind parents have been told by social welfare agencies that they may not raise their own children. The homes of these blind people have been invaded. The children of blind parents have been taken. Often it has been done in secret. The blind parent leaves home in the morning (for the office or to go shopping) and returns home to discover that his or her own child is gone—vanished—taken by the

whim of a social worker or a judge. (No prior notice, no hearing, no due process—simply gone.) The courts and the social welfare agencies do it in the name of protecting the children. They claim that the blind parents are not fit: that the children will not be safe. In the ordinary case involving ordinary human beings this sort of thing does not happen. There must be extraordinary evidence to permit the invasion of a home. To justify breaking up a family the court must find that there is danger to the children. There must be evidence of child abuse, or a strong reason to believe that, without court intervention, there will be child abuse. The court must find that there is an emergency which requires immediate and drastic action. That standard is very difficult to meet. Nevertheless, the courts have decided to take the children from blind parents in several states.

In one case the court ruled that the blind mother could keep her children only if she put locks on all the drawers in the house and gates in front of stairways. The judge thought that the children might fall down the stairs. Maybe they would get into the drawers and find dangerous objects such as knives and scissors. This may be called the "gates and locks" test for safety. If the home of blind parents is so constructed that a child cannot fall, and if the objects in the home are locked away so that the child could not be hurt, then the court will grudgingly permit the child to live with its own parents. The court did not say whether the couch in the living room must be so constructed that the child could not fall off of it.

Of course, this is the very sort of

thing which makes it necessary to have a National Federation of the Blind. In the case in point we went both to the court and the press—and I am pleased to tell you that we were successful. The children are once more at home with their mother, and they are doing quite nicely—no terrible accidents, no pressing danger, no psychological trauma or ruin—only the normal bumps and bruises of childhood—and of course, the love and tenderness which only a mother can provide.

In another case the court removed the child from a blind mother because the child had fallen and bruised its face. The mother took her child to the doctor. Otherwise, the court would never have known that the accident had occurred. The doctor reported the injury to the authorities, and the authorities took the child. The doctor, as it was put, "knew" when he saw the child that it was in danger. This is the "know it when you see it" test for safety. If any person (doctor, minister, social worker, neighbor down the street, or stranger passing through) reports that the child is in danger, and if the parent is blind, the court, by this doctrine, may invade the home and destroy the security of the family. Of course, we could not let these cases stand. We fought them, and we won.

Beginning in the late 60's, the Federation began to take an ever more active role in the courts. In almost every case we were seeking to preserve, protect, and defend the civil rights of the blind. For almost two decades we have had ongoing cases dealing with the right of blind people to teach in the public schools. The names of the people involved call up memories of discrimina-

tion, organized action, battle in the courts, and a succession of triumphs: Evelyn Weckerly ... Pauline Fucinari ... Judy (Miller) Sanders ... Linda Garshwiler ... Joanne Walker ... Judy Gurmankin ... Ellen Schumann ... and Virginia Regan. The National Federation of the Blind relied on the law and went to court, and the teachers got the jobs. To many who hear these words, some of these names will be only that—names—but each constitutes a personal account of rejection, hope, and achievement; and each constitutes a milestone on the long road to freedom which the blind as a people are traveling.

Then there is the civil service. The organized blind has been fighting with civil service officials for so long that it has almost come to be a way of life. The first case in this area ever taken by the Federation started back in 1950. It involved the right of a blind person to take a civil service examination and be put on the register for a job with a federal agency. We lost that fight because the agency abolished the register. The court said the case was moot. The court could not rule that the blind person should be put on the register because no register existed on which to do the putting. However, as a result of the court action, the Congressional pressure, the widespread publicity, and the all-around general uproar, the civil service officials were forced to open at least a few jobs to blind applicants. For the first time in history blind persons could compete for government jobs.

But this was just the beginning. When the city of Chicago refused to permit blind people to take certain civil ser-

---

vice examinations, we brought a lawsuit. The blind can now take those tests. When the state of Minnesota refused to hire a blind computer programmer, we brought a lawsuit. The programmer got the job. In 1980 (30 years after the first civil service case) we of the Federation found ourselves in another action involving federal employment. An economist for the labor department, Al Saille, had no trouble getting a job. He had been working as an economist for the federal government for almost fifteen years. The problem was he could not get fair treatment in gaining a promotion. In other words, we could get in the door, but we were to be kept in the outer room. We had reached a new stage in the battle. The blind were no longer fighting simply to get into the federal civil service. The new fight was not whether we could enter the federal civil service but whether we could get equal treatment once we got in. It is not enough that blind people get jobs at the entry level. There must be pay increases, advancement in rank, and promotion to higher levels as well. In other words, the same kind of treatment that others get. Discrimination does not occur solely during the interview and hiring processes. It can also happen in the course of an ongoing job. It happened to Al Saille. But we fought—and we won. Al Saille got the job.

The decade of the 70's brought a change to the Federation. For the first time we had the money and the capacity to make widespread use of the courts as one of the principal instruments to help us gain equality and first-class status. In the beginning (a decade ago) we took two or three lawsuits a year. To-

day, we count them in dozens.

Through these lawsuits the Federation has demanded that the blind be treated with fairness and respect. We insist that private employers do not discriminate against the blind. Through such cases as Jesse Nash, the Tennessee vendors, and a score of others going back through the years, we have secured the right of blind vendors to work free of unlawful restrictions and to receive the money due them.

Throughout the country in recent years we have battled the medical licensing boards when they have tried to deny licenses to blind doctors on the ground, not that they were not competent, but that they were blind. We have fought with the schools when they would not let blind students attend law school or participate in chemistry labs. We took the Federal Aviation Administration to court when it told us that we could not keep our canes on airplanes. We sued the agencies (the Cleveland Society for the Blind, the Minneapolis Society for the Blind, and others) to bring reform and to insure that blind people receive proper services.

We gained the right to organize in the Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind, the Cincinnati Association for the Blind, and the Houston Lighthouse for the Blind. We insisted that blind people have a right to equal treatment in renting apartments. The cases go on and on.

The first civil rights cases concentrated on the necessities. Are blind people getting the government benefits to which they are entitled? Do the blind have a right to equal treatment when seeking a place to live? Do blind people get jobs without facing discrimination so that the money is there to

pay the bills? These were the questions addressed by the courts when we began to use the lawsuit as a tool to gain equality. Today, we have gone beyond those bare necessities. We have begun asserting our independence in other ways.

Donna Yates wanted to take a Caribbean Cruise. The cruise line told her that, because she was blind, she must stay at home. They were afraid that someone would be required to care for her. Besides, the accommodations on the cruise would be for double occupancy. The clear implication of the cruise line officials was that Donna's cabin mate might find her offensive because she is blind. We fought this unreasonable discrimination, and earlier this year Donna took the cruise.

In an automobile, power is measured in horse power. In a rocket, it is measured in pounds of thrust. In the Federation, one way to measure power is by the reaction of our opponents. Laws change—and not just for us. Each change shapes not just our rights, but the rights of those around us. When a sheltered shop is organized, the bosses who run it find themselves living in a new and different world. As our power grows, the responses from our opponents become more desperate. The increasing level of conflict to which we are subjected is one of the strongest indications of our growth.

In 1981 a member of the Federation, Dean Stanzel, was fired from his job at the Rehabilitation Services Administration because of his work with the Federation to protect the rights of the blind. The firing was brought about by a complaint from the Iowa Commission for the Blind. This action invited a lawsuit. We accepted the invitation, but

before we got to the hearing, the government capitulated. Dean Stanzel got his job back.

In 1978 Bob Acosta decided to ignore democracy in the California affiliate of the Federation. When the California Board of Directors voted to accept his resignation as president, Bob decided only those votes which favored him should count. With this principle clearly in mind, he went to the chapters and shouted down any opposition. This incident brought on a lawsuit. In the ordinary course of things it would have been a brief and unremarkable footnote in the history of the Federation. However, our reactionary agency opponents were running scared. They needed to divert attention from their own unethical behavior, and they wanted to cause dissension in the Federation. There is every evidence they poured money into the lawsuit to keep it alive. Every legal technicality was used to delay and prolong the case. It took five years, but we do not enter lawsuits lightly. You know the story. We prevailed.

A few weeks ago in Morristown, Tennessee, a chapter of the National Federation of the Blind came into being. Many of its members work at the sheltered shop in Morristown. Shop management came and told these workers that they could not join the Federation. If they joined, or if they wrote to their Congressman about the workshop, they would be fired. This is a direct attack upon the Federation and the rights of blind people to work collectively. It is an attack upon the freedom of speech and the freedom of association. It cannot be permitted. The Federation has gone to Morristown, supported the workers, and brought legal action to stop this



outrage.

These three cases (the Dean Stanzel case, the California lawsuit, and the Morristown sheltered shop case) illustrate a pattern. The agencies that oppose the Federation have become increasingly desperate, as they have seen their grip on the lives of blind people loosen. They have attacked the right of blind people to have an organization of their own choosing, governed by the democratic vote of the blind. They have tried to intimidate us when they could. They have tried to control or ruin the Federation when intimidation failed. We won the Dean Stanzel case; we won the California lawsuit; and we will win the Morristown sheltered shop case.

What is in the future for us in the National Federation of the Blind? As I have examined our civil rights cases, I have observed at least two patterns. First, there is the matter of safety. The airlines speak to us of safety, as they segregate us to the first row of seats and take our canes. The courts talk of safety, as they deprive blind parents of their children. Universities tell us safety is the reason that blind people cannot work in chemistry labs. We have come a long way on the road to full equality and first-class citizenship, but there is still much to do. We must meet and defeat that unreasoning fear of blindness which is so often manifested as a concern for safety. In other words, we must use the law to help us abolish the "safety" test.

The second pattern that emerges is the effort by the opponents of the Federation to use the courts as a vehicle for

attack. The attacks may be direct, as in the California lawsuit; or they may be indirect, as in Morristown. In either case, we must meet and defeat them—as we have in the past, and as we certainly shall in the battles to come.

In the future we must expand and strengthen the base of our rights—and the starting point must be the law. We do not have the scope of legal protection that we need to live secure as equal partners with others in society. We must gain that protection, even if only a step at a time. We must gain it through campaigns of public education; we must gain it through mutual encouragement and heightened conscience; but we must also gain it in the statute books and the courtrooms. There is no final safety (no lasting security or real equality) until we have enshrined it in the law.

The history of our movement tells us one thing clearly. The law does change, and we are the agents of change. It is not the legislatures that do it. It is not the courts. We cause it to happen. The dream of full, joyous, unhampered participation takes shape and finds reality in the hearts and the minds of the blind. We—we are the ones who do it. We seek out the legislators. We go before the judges. We talk to the governors, and the officials, and the public-at-large—and when we are through, the laws have changed. The world is a different place. The blind have taken one more step toward freedom. This is the power and importance of the law.



## PAC HITS RECORD HIGH

Many new goals were achieved at the 1983 Convention of the National Federation of the Blind in Kansas City. One of them involved PAC (the Pre-Authorized Check Plan). PAC is the program whereby Federationists sign a card authorizing their banks to withdraw a given amount each month from their checking accounts. PAC has become one of our principal sources of funding, and it has also become a matter of great pride and satisfaction to the individuals involved and, indeed, to the entire organization.

For at least the past six years we have been promising ourselves that we should have at least a thousand members on the PAC Plan, giving total contributions of at least a quarter of a million dollars per year. At the Kansas City Convention we finally made it. It was a promise we had made to ourselves years ago, and we always keep our promises. Day by day as the Convention progressed, the figures kept climbing—and then we went over the top.

Of course, this does not mean that all of our funding needs have been met or that we can slacken the pace. It does not even mean (if we are not careful) that we may not slide back below the quarter million dollar mark—but it does mean that we have reached a historic milestone. How many other organizations do you know who have more than a thousand members who are willing to give an average of more than \$20.00 apiece every month? When the announcement had been made that the goal had been reached, the roar of enthusiasm and satisfaction which came from the audience showed how

hard we had worked, how long we had waited, and how much joy we felt. It was one more triumph in a convention filled with triumphs.

We herewith give three tables. The first shows how much money each state was giving on the PAC Plan as of August 9, 1983. The second shows the number of givers on the PAC Plan from each state as of August 9, 1983. The third shows the average monthly contribution to the PAC Plan made by the givers from each state as of August 9, 1983. It will be observed that as of August 9, 1983, there were 1,019 givers on the PAC Plan. Some of these are individuals; some are families; and some are groups. It will also be observed that as of August 9 the monthly PAC gift was \$21,118.50, with an average monthly contribution of \$20.72 per giver. The total annualized PAC pledge as of August 9 was \$253,422.00.

As has already been said, this is a source of joy and pride. However, we must redouble our efforts, for there are constant changes in the pledges; and as of August 9, we were only \$3,422.00 above that magic quarter of a million dollar mark. Each state should study its ranking to see where it needs to improve, and each individual Federationist should search his or her conscience to see whether it is possible to do more. Especially, those Federationists who have never given on the PAC Plan or who once were givers and now have dropped out should do soul searching.

Many contributors give from \$40.00 to \$100.00 per month. Several give between

\$100.00 and \$200.00 per month. Some give more than \$200.00—and one gives \$250.00. On the other hand, there are many who cannot afford large gifts but contribute what they can month after month. Some give only \$2.50 per month, but the combined total of these smaller gifts constitutes an important element of the program and a major source of strength. Sometimes a \$5.00 gift may constitute as much sacrifice for one person as a \$50.00 gift for another. On the other hand, some of us might (without undue hardship) give more. It is a matter of the conscience, the dedication, and the circumstances of each individual. How important to each of us is our National Federation of the Blind? One answer comes by what we do each month on the PAC Plan. Here are the rankings of the states:

States Ranked by Amount of Money  
Given Each Month on the PAC Plan  
August 9, 1983

1. Maryland	\$1,945.50
2. Michigan	\$1,511.50
3. Minnesota	\$1,456.00
4. Iowa	\$1,221.00
5. Colorado	\$1,185.50
6. Missouri	\$1,012.00
7. California	\$998.50
8. Louisiana	\$793.00
9. Texas	\$783.00
10. Ohio	\$724.50
11. Alaska	\$709.50
12. Kansas	\$652.50
13. New York	\$527.00
14. Massachusetts	\$520.00
15. Illinois	\$510.00
16. Nebraska	\$498.50
17. Virginia	\$461.00
18. South Carolina	\$454.50

19. Idaho	\$440.00
20. Tennessee	\$415.50
21. Washington	\$412.00
22. D.C.	\$410.00
23. Pennsylvania	\$349.00
24. Kentucky	\$320.50
25. North Carolina	\$252.00
26. New Mexico	\$246.50
27. Mississippi	\$229.50
28. Connecticut	\$181.00
29. Florida	\$168.00
30. Indiana	\$165.50
31. Arkansas	\$155.00
32. Wisconsin	\$153.00
33. Oregon	\$137.50
34. New Jersey	\$135.00
35. West Virginia	\$113.00
36. Alabama	\$112.50
37. Utah	\$111.50
38. South Dakota	\$107.50
39. Arizona	\$105.00
40. New Hampshire	\$85.50
41. Georgia	\$80.00
42. Oklahoma	\$63.00
43. Rhode Island	\$40.00
44. Montana	\$37.00
45. Hawaii	\$30.00
46. Vermont	\$25.00
47. North Dakota	\$20.00
48. Nevada	\$15.00
49. Maine	\$15.00
50. Delaware	\$15.00
51. Wyoming	\$10.00

States Ranked by Number of  
Givers on the PAC Plan  
August 9, 1983

1. Maryland	.61
2. South Carolina	.55
3. Missouri	.53
4. Iowa	.46
5. Louisiana	.46
6. California	.45

---



---

7. Colorado	.44
8. Minnesota	.44
9. Ohio	.42
10. Massachusetts	.41
11. Texas	.40
12. Michigan	.31
13. Nebraska	.29
14. Idaho	.28
15. New York	.25
16. Illinois	.22
17. Kentucky	.22
18. Virginia	.22
19. Pennsylvania	.20
20. Tennessee	.20
21. Kansas	.19
22. New Mexico	.17
23. Washington	.17
24. Mississippi	.16
25. Connecticut	.15
26. North Carolina	.15
27. Alabama	.13
28. Oregon	.13
29. Utah	.13
30. Arkansas	.12
31. D.C.	.12
32. Indiana	.12
33. South Dakota	.12
34. Alaska	.11
35. Florida	.11
36. Arizona	.9
37. New Hampshire	.9
38. Georgia	.8
39. West Virginia	.8
40. New Jersey	.7
41. Oklahoma	.7
42. Wisconsin	.7
43. Montana	.4
44. Rhode Island	.4
45. Delaware	.3
46. Hawaii	.2
47. Nevada	.2
48. Wyoming	.2
49. Maine	.1

---



---



---



---

50. North Dakota	.1
51. Vermont	.1

---



---

**States Ranked by Amount of  
Average Monthly Contribution  
Per Giver to the PAC Plan  
August 9, 1983**

1. Alaska	\$64.50
2. Michigan	\$48.75
3. Kansas	\$34.34
4. D.C.	\$34.16
5. Minnesota	\$33.09
6. Maryland	\$31.89
7. Colorado	\$26.94
8. Iowa	\$26.54
9. Vermont	\$25.00
10. Washington	\$24.23
11. Illinois	\$23.18
12. California	\$22.18
13. Wisconsin	\$21.85
14. New York	\$21.08
15. Virginia	\$20.95
16. Tennessee	\$20.77
17. North Dakota	\$20.00
18. Texas	\$19.57
19. New Jersey	\$19.28
20. Missouri	\$19.09
21. Pennsylvania	\$17.45
22. Ohio	\$17.25
23. Louisiana	\$17.23
24. Nebraska	\$17.18
25. North Carolina	\$16.80
26. Idaho	\$15.71
27. Florida	\$15.27
28. Hawaii	\$15.00
29. Maine	\$15.00
30. Kentucky	\$14.56
31. New Mexico	\$14.50
32. Mississippi	\$14.34
33. West Virginia	\$14.12
34. Indiana	\$13.79
35. Arkansas	\$12.91

---



---

36. Massachusetts . . . . .	\$12.68	44. Oklahoma . . . . .	\$9.00
37. Connecticut . . . . .	\$12.06	45. South Dakota . . . . .	\$8.95
38. Arizona . . . . .	\$11.66	46. Alabama . . . . .	\$8.65
39. Oregon . . . . .	\$10.57	47. Utah . . . . .	\$8.57
40. Georgia . . . . .	\$10.00	48. South Carolina . . . . .	\$8.26
41. Rhode Island . . . . .	\$10.00	49. Nevada . . . . .	\$7.50
42. New Hampshire . . . . .	\$9.50	50. Delaware . . . . .	\$5.00
43. Montana . . . . .	\$9.25	51. Wyoming . . . . .	\$5.00

## DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE BLIND AS MOBILITY INSTRUCTORS

### THE CERTIFICATION RACKET

by Fred Schroeder

Delivered at the Annual Convention of the  
National Federation of the Blind  
Kansas City, Missouri, July 7, 1983

In the summer of 1978, I completed my Master's Degree in the field of special education. It was my desire to pursue a career as a teacher of blind children. In order to have the most comprehensive training possible, I applied to the orientation and mobility program at San Francisco State University. I was accepted into the program which required taking courses for two consecutive summers. In the summer of 1979, I took the intermediate and advanced mobility classes and the following summer student taught at the Orientation Center for the Blind in Albany, California.

During this time, I was working as a travel teacher at the Orientation Center in Lincoln, Nebraska. Mrs. Barbara Walker was my immediate supervisor. Under her direction and with her encouragement, I learned the techniques I needed for teaching cane travel as a blind person, as well as the philosophi-

cal framework upon which independent travel is based.

In the Nebraska Center the emphasis was on developing confidence through experience. My role was to teach basic techniques which could be relied on to work. In time, the students would learn to modify these techniques in order to develop a style of travel which they found most comfortable. The idea was a simple one. When students learned to travel safely through a residential area they were given route after route which would help them refine and master that particular set of skills. At first, I would accompany the students, but later they were sent out alone. In this way, students would begin developing true confidence in their own ability to keep themselves safe. Next, the student would be given routes with a new twist. One day the student may come upon construction or a street which did not go

through. In this way, students learned to rely on their own ability to reason their way out of tight situations. They found that they did not need to worry about the unexpected. They found that no matter what the situation they could rely on themselves—not their travel teacher—to keep themselves safe and to get where they were going. This same process was used at every stage throughout the training. I would work with my students on crossing major intersections with traffic lights until they had learned to use the sound of the traffic to judge the change of the light and to make a straight crossing. Then I would assign the student routes which would involve crossing many busy intersections, thereby increasing the student's skill, as well as developing a sense of confidence. Eventually, students would master bus travel and begin traveling through the downtown area of Lincoln. At that point, students would begin planning their own routes. They would begin shopping for items and traveling to places they chose for themselves. They may have been sent to large shopping centers or to find a particular office on the University campus. Whatever the route, the goal was to convince my students that they could travel safely and confidently in unfamiliar areas.

Then there were the infamous travel routes known as "drops." These routes consisted of taking a student in a car and driving around town until the student was completely lost. Then the student was given a bus token and told to find his or her way back to the center. If necessary, the student was allowed to ask one question of a passerby. At first, the idea of a drop may seem intimidating and unnecessarily

harsh. However, it was these qualities that made it a critical part of the student's training. By being placed in a situation where you are more lost than you could ever possibly get yourself in real life, and using your common sense to get yourself out of it, tears down forever the fear of not knowing where you are. Fear is what keeps blind people from traveling independently. The key is in showing a blind person in situation after situation that he or she can handle whatever comes up. The techniques of travel are simply the tools a blind person uses to travel and are useless without the blind person's ability to reason and to exercise judgment.

After my first year of teaching in Nebraska I went off to San Francisco State to begin my course work in orientation and mobility. There were six of us in the mobility program. We divided into teams and alternated between being the student and the teacher for each lesson. I found the approach to be completely opposite from that with which I was familiar. The emphasis was on learning techniques with only lip service being given to the development of confidence. For the first week or so, we were not given canes. We were taught to travel around the building with our hands out in front of us in what was called protective arm techniques. We were taught to slide our feet to find steps and to trail along walls. In short, all of the classic stereotypes about blind people shuffling their feet and groping with their hands were standardized and formalized under the broad classification of pre-cane techniques. From the start, we were taught to assume that a blind person could only travel along a memorized path after being given



highly detailed instructions. A student may be given a route such as traveling west along hall A, turning south down hall B, and trailing along the right hand wall past two doorways until coming to the water fountain. As routes became more complex the student may have to locate several objects such as the water fountain and then the elevator, and so on, always with explicit, detailed instructions. Before leaving the area of pre-cane skills, there were exhaustive lessons in orienting a student to a room, as well as learning how to teach a blind person to sit in a chair.

Next, we advanced to cane travel. Again, each lesson was constructed so as to provide the blind person with minute detail about the route he or she would be taking. Nothing was left up to the judgment of the blind person. If you were walking down the street and came upon a car parked across the sidewalk, you were not allowed to simply walk around the car, but rather were instructed in a technique whereby you held the cane diagonally in front of you with one hand while trailing around the car with the other. There was also a technique developed known as "recovery from veer." This is not a treatment for a rare tropical disease, but rather was designed to deal with the problem of angling while crossing a street. Again, it was not assumed that a blind person would be aware of his or her mistake and use reason to handle the situation. Instead, there was a complicated procedure involving a "ten-two" search technique followed by the use of the "touch and drag" technique for locating the desired sidewalk. For fear of becoming too technical, I will not attempt to explain the intricacies of the "ten-two"

technique nor the "touch and drag" technique as they are highly complex and require training at the Master's level. Nevertheless, the attitude underlying these techniques is perfectly transparent. The mobility profession is striving to develop a variety of formulas, requiring no judgment on the part of the blind person, which will enable you to cope with every eventuality.

It was at this time that I first began to be seriously challenged about whether I, as a blind person, should be training to become an orientation and mobility specialist. One orientation and mobility specialist asked me if I thought that my students would be fearful of having a blind travel teacher. She told me that she had asked a number of her students at the Braille Institute if they would be comfortable having a blind travel teacher and was told that they would not. I told the mobility instructor that her students at the Braille Institute had never had a blind travel teacher nor known of a blind travel teacher and, therefore, it was not surprising that they might initially have some concerns. The mobility instructor replied by telling me that if she were wearing sleep shades she would not trust a blind person to get her safely across a street. Later on another mobility instructor asked me if I thought it was reasonable for me to work with students on learning to cross busy streets. "After all," she said, "what if there was a quirk in the traffic pattern which made your student believe it was safe to cross when in fact, it really was not, and what if that same quirk in the traffic pattern also misled you into believing that it was safe to cross?" This type of reasoning is revealing. If it

is possible for there to be some theoretical quirk in a traffic pattern which could dupe me into crossing a street when it is unsafe, then my existence on this world seems tentative at best. If I believed that I could be misled in this way, then I would not be out risking my life on a daily basis whether or not I was accompanying a travel student. What both of these mobility instructors were saying was that the skills of independent travel are safe enough on which to teach a blind person to rely, but are not so safe that either of them would be willing to risk their own lives.

Either the techniques of independent travel work or they do not. I believe that they do and further believe that it makes sense for a blind person to teach another blind person how to travel. Lest you think me visionary or radical, let me hasten to add that prior to World War II the only ways blind people learned to travel were either on their own or by asking other blind people for help. None of you in this room needs a Master's Degree to know whether a particular technique works well or whether it does not. None of you in this room needs a Master's Degree to learn that moving the cane in front of you from side to side is a practical way to keep yourself safe. There is no right way to travel nor wrong way to travel. There are only techniques which work well and others which do not. In my own life I use those techniques which work for me and modify or abandon those which do not. But of greatest importance is my own ability to practice good judgment and common sense. It was for this reason that I wished to pursue a career as an orientation and mobility specialist.

After completing my student teaching

in the summer of 1980, I submitted an application for orientation and mobility certification to the American Association of Workers for the Blind (AAWB). Prior to 1980, the AAWB had required that an individual have a visual acuity of no less than 20/40 to be certified. In 1980, this requirement was abolished and replaced by a standard of functional abilities. In this way, the AAWB claimed that it no longer had a discriminatory vision requirement, but rather had a way of functionally assessing whether or not an applicant had the necessary skills to teach independent travel.

It is my considered opinion that the AAWB functional standards are simply an operational definition of good vision and are intended to exclude blind people from the profession. For example, one of the functional abilities required by AAWB asks, "Can the applicant, moving in an unfamiliar area, assess collision paths of a student with parking meters from a distance of 125 feet...?" Another item asks, "Can the applicant describe actions and gross techniques of a student from a distance of 250 feet...?" And still another asks, "Can the applicant, while moving, determine potential collision paths between student and moving objects at distances of 10 to 375 feet?" It is clear that these standards were written with the sole purpose of excluding blind people from the orientation and mobility profession.

In spite of AAWB's newly adopted functional abilities standards, I applied for O & M certification at the completion of my university training. My original application packet did not include the Functional Abilities Assessment Checklist. I was told by my uni-

versity supervisor, Mr. Pete Wurzbarger, that I would be sent a copy of the Functional Abilities Assessment Checklist after submitting the other portions of my application. I sent my application to the then chairman of the Certification Committee, Mr. William Wiener. Mr. Wiener wrote me back and told me that I would need to obtain the Functional Abilities Assessment Checklist from my university supervisor. This seemed odd since the other students with whom I had graduated had received copies of the document directly from Mr. Wiener. I then contacted my university supervisor, Mr. Wurzbarger, and explained the situation. Eventually, he located a copy of the checklist and, after filling it out, sent it to Mr. Wiener. In July of 1981 I traveled to Toronto to the AAWB conference in order to learn whether I would be certified by the AAWB Board. When my name was not among those listed by Mr. Wiener as being recommended for certification by the Certification Committee, I inquired as to why. Mr. Wiener stated that my Functional Abilities Assessment Checklist had only been received six weeks earlier and, therefore, my application was completed too late to be considered by the Committee. He told me that my application would be considered at the next board meeting in October. Early that fall, I was advised that the AAWB Board was no longer reviewing applications for certification quarterly and would only consider applications at their annual conference. In July of 1982 I traveled to Orlando, Florida, again hoping to learn of the status of my application. Again, my name was not among those recommended by the Certifi-

cation Committee. When I inquired of the new chairman, Mr. Robert Mills, about my application, I was told that he was not aware that I was still interested in certification and, therefore, the Committee had taken no action on my application. This seemed hard to believe since he also told me that he had circulated copies of my Functional Abilities Assessment Checklist to the members of the Committee. I assured Mr. Mills that I was still interested in pursuing certification and encouraged him to bring the matter to the Committee as soon as possible. In March of this year, I received a letter from Mr. Mills stating that the Certification Committee had recommended to the Board of Directors that I not be granted certification. He went on to tell me that the Board had accepted the Committee's recommendation. I wrote Mr. Mills and inquired as to my right of appeal. He wrote back and told me that I had none. Next, I wrote to the National President of AAWB and eventually obtained the right to have my situation reviewed at a hearing before the Board. That hearing will take place on Saturday evening, July 9, 1983. My attorney, Mr. Marc Maurer, has agreed to accompany me to the meeting in Phoenix.

We will continue to battle the AAWB until we are successful in gaining equal access into the orientation and mobility field. We will not quit until this right has been won. As our National President, Dr. Kenneth Jernigan, has been known to say, "We often lose skirmishes, we sometimes lose battles, but we never lose wars, for the war is never over until we prevail."

---

## THE BLIND AND THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF TRAVEL

by Martin J. Darity  
Assistant Secretary for Tourism Marketing  
U. S. Travel and Tourism Administration  
Delivered at the Annual Convention of the  
National Federation of the Blind  
Kansas City, Missouri, July 6, 1983

Dr. Jernigan and members of the National Federation of the Blind, I am delighted to be with you today to talk about my favorite subject—tourism!

The Travel and Tourism market in the United States is worth about 200 billion dollars a year to our economy. Based on the fact that there are about 35 million handicapped Americans, our estimates are that approximately 30 billion dollars per year is spent on travel and tourism by blind and handicapped people in this country. The primary mission of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration is to promote tourism to and into the United States.

President Reagan declared 1982 as our own National Year of Disabled Persons. Over a year ago, I became interested and consequently heavily involved in finding out more about the needs and problems of blind and handicapped travelers. I have been working closely with Dr. Harold Snider, President of the Society for the Advancement of Travel for the Handicapped, which is a leading travel industry organization for promotion and improvement of travel and tourism opportunities for blind and handicapped people. Dr. Snider, an active member and leader in the National Federation of the Blind, and the Society for the Advancement of Travel for the Handicapped has

close links with the National Federation of the Blind.

On February 9 and 10, 1983, the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration and the Society for the Advancement of Travel for the Handicapped jointly sponsored a conference on improving and promoting travel and tourism opportunities for the blind and handicapped. The conference was keyed by Under Secretary for Travel and Tourism, Peter McCoy.

That meeting and your meeting here in Kansas City tells us something about the society in which we live. It tells us that our society: is committed to the principle of equal opportunity; respects the right of its citizens to exercise their talents and realize their potential; and is dedicated to improving our quality of life.

The National Tourism Policy Act is one indication of this concern. One of its objectives—and I quote—is to, "make the opportunity for and benefits of tourism and recreation in the United States universally accessible to residents of the United States and foreign countries..."

Many barriers to the handicapped have been removed, but despite these advances, there is a long, unfinished agenda with respect to equal access to tourism and recreation for the handi-

---



capped. We've got to do better.

Mr. James Gashel, Director of Governmental Affairs for the National Federation of the Blind, presented the banquet speech at our conference. Mr. Gashel's remarks were both educational and inspirational.

In his remarks, Mr. Gashel explained, in detail, the problems which blind travelers face when traveling. He explained in vivid detail the kinds of problems which the blind traveler encounters when staying in a hotel or joining a tour group. He outlined the actions which the National Federation of the Blind has taken in the courtroom and in the hearing room to insure the rights of blind people to travel freely, as equal, first-class members of society. I like organizations which do something and don't just talk about it.

I would like to briefly outline programs available for the handicapped traveler in various states. This information was obtained from a survey conducted by the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration following our conference in Washington.

The state of Arkansas has a 25-member Governor's Committee on People with Disabilities; Iowa has a brochure published by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped; Maine's Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped handles telephone requests and provides assistance to the local chambers of commerce; Nevada publishes the Nevada Informer and Rights Handbook for the Handicapped; North Carolina is planning a brochure to provide information on tourist travel access; the state of Delaware's public museums and state parks are all accessible, private museums are accessible and

several offer programs to the handicapped; and the state of Wisconsin publishes many brochures through their "Programs for Independent Living."

As the oldest and largest organization of blind people in this country, with over 50,000 members, you are truly the blind speaking for themselves. You control your own destiny, protect your own rights, and seek advancement for the cause of blind people every day across this country in your affiliates in every state. The dynamic leadership of your President, Dr. Kenneth Jernigan, reflects the kind of organization you are.

My presence here with you, not just to deliver these brief remarks, but to be here with you to discuss your concerns with Dr. Jernigan and others, should indicate to you the high regard and esteem in which the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration holds the National Federation of the Blind.

Both Dr. Snider and Mr. Gashel have made me aware of the history as well as the current problems which you as blind people face when traveling.

The U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration is not a regulatory agency. But so far as your concerns affect tourism, we wish to do whatever we can to be of help in solving the problems which you as blind people experience.

Although I am not in a position to enforce or interpret federal safety regulations, I will do everything in my power to serve as a sympathetic channel of communication where my assistance and expertise may be of value. I would like you to clearly understand that my door is always open to the leadership and the members of the National Federation of the Blind and that I will do everything in my power to work with you in protect-



ing the rights of blind persons to freedom of travel.

During this summer, the House Subcommittee on Commerce and Tourism will be holding the first series of hearings ever to be conducted about travel for the handicapped. The U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration has been asked to offer testimony at those hearings about ways in which the Congress can improve and promote travel and tourism opportunities for blind and handicapped Americans. Also, during the coming year, the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration and the Society for the Advancement of Travel for the Handicapped will again be conducting another conference on travel and tourism opportunities for the blind and handicapped. I hope that the National Federation of the Blind will join with us as a partner in that conference.

I know that one of the principal concerns of blind people is employment. It is my understanding that seventy percent of the working age blind people in the United States are either unemployed or underemployed. I know that the National Federation of the Blind has been operating an outstanding program of Job Opportunities for the Blind with the U.S. Department of Labor to help blind people find employment. I pledge that during my time in office I will work with the National Federation of the Blind and Job Opportunities for the Blind to do what we can to improve employment prospects for blind people in the travel and tourism industry. I am well aware that

there are a wide variety of jobs which blind people can do in the travel and tourism industry without major job restructuring and adaption. I will do everything in my power to widen these job opportunities so that more blind people can take advantage of employment in the fastest growing industry in this country—the travel and tourism industry.

The U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration produces and distributes promotional information about travel opportunities in the United States through its offices overseas. To our knowledge, to date, none of that information is available on tape or in Braille for blind visitors. I want to work with the National Federation of the Blind to explore cost effective ways in which this information may be produced so that blind people can read it.

This annual convention of the National Federation of the Blind is an important travel and tourism event in itself, since it is the largest gathering of blind people in the world. The economic contribution which the National Federation of the Blind already makes to the travel and tourism industry should be more widely recognized.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you today for a few minutes to talk about travel and tourism and the right of the blind to travel freely. I look forward to being with you for as much of the convention as I may be able to attend.

---

## LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY: CURRENT APPLICATIONS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

by Frank Kurt Cylke, Director  
National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped  
Library of Congress  
Delivered at the Annual Convention of the  
National Federation of the Blind  
Kansas City, Missouri, July 6, 1983

Technology! Technology is a magnificent and wondrous word. It implies all that is American and all that makes our country so strong. Today I will use the term technology as it has been popularly defined—"the application of scientific knowledge to practical purposes."

I will spend no effort on demonstrating the fact that the services provided by the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped are formed on a technological base. Everyone in this room is well aware of the contributions of both Louis Braille and Thomas A. Edison. Without their work we would not have the tactile and audio foundation on which current library materials are produced and reproduced.

Rather, I will discuss a few of the more promising technological applications that should prove useful to the advancement of library services in the near and not so distant future.

But first—to set the stage—let me list a mixed group of technological applications and devices currently in use, or under study, which should help focus our thoughts to the subject: compositors tapes; optical character recognition; tangible graphic displays; tone output reading machines; pitch restoration; 1/4-track audio cassettes; 1/2-

track speed audio cassettes; automatic rewind; amplification devices; solar charging panels; remote control mechanisms; extension levers; automatic print to Braille; voice output; print facsimile transmission; Braille facsimile transmission; and micro-computers.

In this list there is enough material to consume a multi-day seminar. However, today we have but a few minutes for my presentation and a few additional minutes for your questions.

So, now I will briefly consider selected technological applications that have and are making a difference in how many individuals use the library program:

### On/Off Remote Controls and Other Devices

For many readers, particularly those who are confined to bed or have limited mobility, a new remote-control unit can aid in independent use of NLS playback machines. The unit turns any NLS playback machine on or off when the machine is within hearing range but too far away to reach, or if the machine's on and off switches are too difficult to handle. Other machine controls, such as volume and tone, must be set in advance.

This accessory is now available for patrons who are certified as eligible by their network library.

The two-part remote unit consists of a transmitter, operated by the reader, and a receiver, which must be attached to the playback machine. For cassette machines, the receiver is plugged into the remote jack on the side of the machine. For disc machines, the machine is plugged into the receiver which is, in turn, plugged into an electrical outlet.

A light touch activates the transmitter. An additional option for patrons who need this type of control is a breath switch which plugs into the transmitter.

The remote-control unit operates through ultrasonic sound, and the two sections do not have to be aligned directly. They are designed to operate from either direct or reflected sound transmission.

The units are available in three different colors—black, beige, and orange—to designate three different frequencies. Because the operating range of the units is about fifty feet, different frequencies must be assigned to prevent interference when several units are used within this distance, as could occur in adjacent beds or rooms in a nursing home.

Remote-control units are the accessory produced most recently for patrons with special needs, but are only one of several such items. Others are: Extension levers for cassette player controls—for those with limited use of their hands or fingers; Tone-arm clips for disc machines—for patrons with limited use of their hands or fingers; Pillowphones for bedridden men and women; Headphones for private listening and for patrons with some hearing loss; Special amplifiers for individuals with severe hear-

ing loss; and Solar panels for recharging cassette batteries—for persons in remote areas without electricity.

Certification of need is required before issuing other accessories besides remote controls. Such certification is particularly vital in the case of the amplifier, because the volume level provided could damage normal hearing.

### Solar Panels

Our Library of Congress designed solar panels are used to charge batteries for use in cassette machines or in some disc players.

The panel itself measures 8 inches, by 8-1/2 inches, by 1/2 inch and contains eighteen photovoltaic cells. A wire from the panel runs to the battery holder. One or two battery packs can be charged at a time. When the panel is exposed to sunlight, the cells change the energy from the light into more than enough electricity to charge the batteries.

This device is intended for use by patrons in areas where there is no electricity. It has been used in wilderness areas in this country—Idaho and Arizona for example—and by a few of our patrons living abroad. One user is currently a volunteer in a southern African nation.

### Voice Indexing on Cassette

A cassette reader wants to locate a short story contained in a large collection, or recipes from a favorite cookbook, or a word in a dictionary. In response to these needs, a refined voice indexing system has been developed, tested, and proven by NLS and outside experts.

The voice indexing technique enables readers, using the fast forward speed on

their cassette player, to hear guide words like those at the top of printed pages in dictionaries, directories, and other reference works. When the desired guide word is heard, the machine can be stopped and switched to normal speed. The subject content then will correspond to the guide word heard on fast forward.

The automatic machine used to produce these indexed cassettes creates the final cassette by blending two separate tapes: one containing the text and tones indicating when indexed words are required, and the other containing a list of the index words. The machine superimposes the index words over the narrated text at sixteen times the speed of the text so that the index words are heard and understood only when played in fast forward. The device also compensates for the variation of speed from the beginning to the end of the tape in fast forward, resulting in a normal pitch indexed voice throughout the entire tape.

To test this technique, NLS originally produced a sample indexed version of a section of the pocket edition of the American Heritage Dictionary and then proceeded to produce a full cassette version. The full dictionary will be out soon. It will be available both through the NLS library system and available for sale to blind or handicapped individuals at a reasonable cost.

#### Easy Cassette Machine

An easy-to-operate cassette playback machine with the fewest possible number of controls has been in development for the past several years. The machine is designed for individuals who do not require all the options currently on the standard machine and want a more auto-

matic operation. It will be an alternative to our standard machine, not a replacement.

To operate you simply insert the cassette, start the machine and select the volume in one easy operation, and then read—for up to six hours. There is no need to touch the machine again until you're ready for the next cassette.

An operating prototype model was produced and tested with a small number of readers selected by the Washington, D.C., library. It has only two main controls, both easily located at the front of the machine and operated differently—one is a sliding switch and the other is a push button. Moving the sliding switch from the stop position to the right will start the tape and select the volume. Depressing the button rewinds the tape and permits review of information.

The cassette is ejected by sliding open a door and depressing the tape deck and does not require a control switch for removal.

Controls on the standard model either not needed or not available on this machine are the side-selector switch, tone control key, and all the speed controls—speed selection, variable speed, and fast forward. Three of the separate controls on the standard model—stop, play, and volume—are combined into one.

Some controls are not needed because of automatic features. The tape rewinds automatically when a cassette is inserted into the tape deck, and an audible beep signals when the tape is ready to play. At the end of each side, the motor reverses and a head is activated to play in the new direction; there is no need to turn the cassette over.

### Cassette Braille

Earlier today you learned about the current state of cassette Braille. As you may know, we also have expended a significant effort in studying cassette Braille. We wanted to determine if: its use would not compromise the quality of Braille service; and if it would be a cost-effective method of providing Braille.

We ask users to comment. In summary, our final determination was that engineering changes are required to reduce user fatigue and to improve reliability.

### Conclusion

Obviously technology has played an important role in the Library of Congress program. What may not be so obvious from my remarks is the number of efforts that have been made to fit technology to the program to no avail.

It is enough to say that the Library of Congress program that works to serve your library needs is technology-based and will continue to be in future years. New applications will be sought and used when and where appropriate.

Now for your questions—

## **EOC OFFICE RECEPTIONISTS PROVING SIGHTLESS CAN BE USEFUL WORKERS**

by Charlie Rahm, Staff Writer

(Reprinted from the St. Joseph (Missouri) News and Press.)

(Note: Pauline Murphy is one of the leaders of the Missouri affiliate of the Federation.)

Pauline Murphy doesn't see anything funny about people referring to the blind leading the blind. In fact, Mrs. Murphy doesn't see anything at all—and neither does the person she's training.

Mrs. Murphy is blind. She is also the receptionist at the Economic Opportunity Corporation of Greater St. Joseph. Kathy Miller is blind, too. She is working side by side this summer with Mrs. Murphy.

Watching them leaves the impression that it's an ideal situation.

The desk at the local EOC office is familiar to Mrs. Murphy. She has been the receptionist at the office for the past three years. She handles all in-

coming calls on a multi-line telephone system, operates the photocopying machine, files and distributes office supplies, types, and greets visitors to the office.

Mrs. Murphy is confident of her skills as a receptionist and feels right at home in her working quarters.

Miss Miller, who is 16 years old, will be a sophomore next year at Central High School. She is employed at the EOC office this summer through the Summer Youth Employment program.

Miss Miller has not yet developed the confidence or the skills that Mrs. Murphy has, but she has come a long way.

Part of the reason is because Mrs. Murphy knows what Miss Miller is going through. She also realizes that if her student is to learn the skills she will need to perform as a secretary in the

---



work force, she cannot be given the special treatment a sighted person is apt to give.

"I can't offend Kathy and she can't offend me," Mrs. Murphy says. "We can talk about each other being blind, but a sighted person might feel awkward doing so."

Mrs. Murphy admits that she probably is tougher on Miss Miller than a more sympathetic sighted person might be.

"I expect more out of Kathy than a sighted person might because if she wasn't catching on, they might say 'that's OK Kathy.'"

While the EOC office is equipped with machines that help a blind person perform tasks more easily, Mrs. Murphy says they are not necessary. In fact, she says most blind persons can function quite well in an office with ordinary equipment.

"Employers need to know that there are blind people in this community and they can learn to perform jobs," Mrs. Murphy says. She adds that often all that is needed is a little help from co-workers.

Mrs. Murphy says co-workers at the EOC office have helped her by doing relatively simple things, such as putting raised letters and numbers over the flat ones on the office copy machine. The simple process enables her to operate a

machine she ordinarily could not have.

"Where there is a will there is a way," Mrs. Murphy says. "If Kathy wants to know how to do something all she needs to do is open up her mouth and ask people about ways she might be able to do things."

After four weeks on the job, Miss Miller has learned most of the skills she would need to be the receptionist at the EOC office. With six more weeks to go, she hopes to learn them all. She is making progress.

"Kathy definitely has improved," Mrs. Murphy says. "Her confidence in herself is much better and she has learned to speak up."

"I'm proud of what I've learned," Miss Miller says matter-of-factly. She also knows what she wants to achieve. She wants to finish high school and attend a secretarial college.

"I would like to be a secretary," she says.

Mrs. Murphy also knows what she wants to achieve. She would like to get a college degree and be an in-home teacher and do rehabilitative work with blind people.

Based on what Miss Miller has learned under the watchful hands of Mrs. Murphy, both objectives seem within reach.

---

If you or a friend would like to remember the National Federation of the Blind in your will, you can do so by employing the following language:

"I give, devise, and bequeath unto National Federation of the Blind, a District of Columbia nonprofit corporation, the sum of \$\_\_\_\_\_ (or "\_\_\_\_\_percent of my net estate" or "The following stocks and bonds: \_\_\_\_\_") to be used for its worthy purposes on behalf of blind persons."

---

---

**AND THE WINNER IS...**

by Gerald M. Kass, Executive Vice President  
Jewish Braille Institute of America  
Delivered at the Annual Convention of the  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
Kansas City, Missouri, July 6, 1983

Well, each year gets better and better.

Good morning, fellow Federationists.

For the past two years I have begun my speeches by singing to you. Having had rather mixed reviews, I've decided to give up my dubious career as a crooner and begin my comments this year with a riddle. Are you ready?

How many letters are there in the alphabet? Did I hear someone say 26? Then I'm afraid you are behind the times. Everyone knows there are 24, because in the summer of 1982, ET went home.

The film "ET" was marvelous. A triumph of the motion picture industry. Often people wrongly assume that blind persons never go to the movies and are totally unaware of motion pictures. So in many ways my comments this morning, if they do nothing else, will tell sighted people that the blind do not live in a world isolated from everyone else.

Part of this world are the various rites of spring. Some rites of spring are part of nature. Flowers pollinate each other and animals, including people, follow suit choosing their own styles according to species. The tradition of the June wedding is no mere accident. Other rites of spring are created by society among which few have

the glamour, fanfare, and public interest as the presentation of the Academy Awards, the film industry's technique for getting all of us to spend more and more dollars going to the movies. Weeks prior to the event the nominees are announced. That night each nominee has showered or bathed according to his or her personal taste, dressed lavishly, and been chauffeured to a location either in New York or Hollywood, having prayed to all gods in existence that of the five nominees in their category their names will be the ones announced. If fortune does shine upon them, each one will arise from his or her seat all aglitter, walk up to the podium, and with appropriate statements of humility—most often requiring their best acting talents, even more so than their original performance—they will proceed to thank all who made that great moment possible. They ignore not even the pet canary at home who went to sleep two hours before the program began. Many words will be said that evening interrupted only by renditions of the five nominees for the best original song. During the evening there are four words which will be repeated several times that summon up the greatest excitement. Those words are: "And the winner is..." These words will precede the announcement of who gave the "Best Performance

---

by an Actress," "Best Performance by an Actor," "Who Moves Mountains Best," and "Who Created the Most Fascinating Monster for Summer Moviegoers." However, the piece de resistance comes when these words, "And the winner is..." precede what will be acclaimed the Best Motion Picture of the Year.

Let us now think about some of those films that have won this coveted award as well as those which were nominated for it and did not achieve that pinnacle of recognition. Many of them, through genius of wit and concept, probe the basic issues which are important to all society including the blind in the United States in quest for equality, opportunity, and security.

### "ET"

There are many in Hollywood who still cannot understand why the film "ET" was so phenomenally successful. Certainly there is no shortage in the history of the celluloid product of aliens from other planets. They arrive quite regularly without the benefit of passport, do their own thing, and so on. Some aliens have been hostile, but, of course, there have been many who have been friendly. Why then the success of ET?

An alien spaceship arrives and several of its creatures disembark and take a stroll. An emergency departure is necessary because of fear of detection. All the alien creatures make it back to the spaceship in time for lift-off, except one. And he becomes ET, our friendly visitor. He is discovered by children who, temporarily taken by surprise, are soon able to accept him fully. However, they instantly understand the need to conceal him from the adult

world, which they feel will not react well to him. As the film unfolds, ET becomes symbolic of good and right. He is peace-loving, friendly, and he wants to teach the children wonderful things. In short, he is everything that humankind has been unable to achieve, and keep in mind he had to come from a highly technically advanced society since he did arrive through the courtesy of a spaceship.

Eventually ET becomes very ill and he tries to contact his alien space culture because he wants to go home. It is hard for the good to survive on earth. Towards the end of the film he has even developed sympathetic life-systems with a young boy, and as ET's heart and circulatory system deteriorate so do those of the child. Then the systems begin to function independently; the child improves as ET dies. His body is then put into a chamber to preserve it for scientific reasons. Miraculously, he comes alive. The children aid him in escaping, and at last ET goes home.

The theme is not an unfamiliar one. Pure good is introduced into the world. It is rejected by the establishment. It dies and is resurrected into the sky and beyond. Although I represent The Jewish Braille Institute, I do see a similar theme in the theology of Christianity and Islam, as well as the Prophets of Israel. The world's rejection of that which has been introduced as its most viable hope.

The NFB has as its main mission the introduction into the chaotic and often dreary world in which many blind persons live the only realistic philosophy of hope and redemption that will eventually make sense in the lives of blind persons. There are many who seek to ignore

it by calling it unrealistic. Many of those who have been involved in "work for the blind" since Hector was a pup are often unable to accept this breath of fresh air. However, those who have the power of faith which, because of its rigor and dedication has not been destroyed, recognize the promise of a spiritual resurrection which will give life anew to blind persons in this country and elsewhere. It is upon this foundation that our faith as Federationists stands firmly and strong and no prophet of gloom or doom shall shake it, even for a moment.

A critically acclaimed masterwork of the motion picture media was "A Man For All Seasons" in which Paul Scofield portrayed Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England under the ever colorful Henry VIII. It is an interesting study of Sir Thomas and the classical struggle between principle and compromise. We are all too sophisticated to say "there is never room for compromise." Of course, there are many times when, through reasonable compromise, progress is made toward achieving very important goals. However, there are the other times when the compromising of principle destroys any and all possibility of the survival of those goals. Here is Sir Thomas More who, by British tradition, holds his office as the great expediter. Appointed by the King, it is his job to guide the King's wishes unmodified through the political course. He as Chancellor of England must be a professional remover of obstacles. He has a problem: He is a Roman Catholic, devoutly so, and the King wishes a new bride. If he influences the Pope (pressuring him into granting Henry an annulment from his first wife), he has completely compro-

mised his own principles. If he does not secure an annulment, Henry will take it upon himself to remove the English Church from the Church of Rome, perhaps exposing England to dynastic wars and other chaos in the future. Clearly, the first alternative is the easiest—if conscience can be put aside—but alas, Sir Thomas cannot put his conscience aside. He is removed from office, England leaves the embrace of the Church of Rome, and Sir Thomas is beheaded. On first examination one would say what a totally impractical man Thomas was. Would it not have been better just to go along with Henry? After all, was it worth all that happened just because he refused to compromise on one single issue? Thomas could not compromise for two reasons. The first, rather idealistic, that one figuratively holds his soul like water in his hands and once his fingers have separated, even for a moment, the water runs out and can never be recaptured. Once a movement has lost its soul, it is no longer a movement. His second objection was for very practical reasons. Thomas understood the nature of a bully, and Henry was of that ilk. A bully can never, never be accommodated. His appetite for having his own way is insatiable! Henry did not stop with the issue of the annulment. In fact, he did not stop with just a second wife. From Catherine and Anne Boleyn, he went on to Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, Catherine Howard, and Catherine Parr, six in all, and had death not taken him, neither you nor I know how high the count would have gone. He then proceeded to rob the Church of its assets and reduce it to a political instrument. No, at certain times you stand fast and pray and struggle and



persevere because the wrong compromise not only loses you your soul but everything else for which you might hope and all you cherish. And it is this steadfastness that has been the strength and backbone and character of the NFB.

### "TOOTSIE"

Before I saw the film "Tootsie" I knew very little about it. Somebody had told me that it was a very funny movie all about Dustin Hoffman in drag. By the way, does everyone know what drag means? Yes, I guess everyone does. It simply means that he is wearing women's clothes—wig, eyelashes, lipstick, and heels—during the key parts of his performance.

"Tootsie" is one of the most complex movies, because it has so many underlying themes. The story-line is simple: Dustin Hoffman is an actor who can no longer get employment because he has developed a bad reputation—he makes waves—he is recalcitrant; he tells every screen writer how to write and every director how to direct. He never seems to compromise, which no doubt can be a bad trait.

To overcome his unemployment syndrome he applies for a job acting in a TV soap opera. The only twist is that the part for which he is applying is a female role. Well, hair in place, dressed in a dress and with heavy makeup, he appears for the audition. Those doing the casting, who are unaware of his true sexual identity, find something different about his (or should I say her) qualities. A directness, an assertiveness, a strength of character. The change from the expected is so interesting that Hoffman lands the part. As the weeks go by, he or she becomes a hero or heroine—a

rallying figure for many women who have suppressed these qualities as they were "socialized" into the traditional role of womanhood. Two people fall in love with her, or him. One is a man and the other a woman. The man, believing Hoffman to be a woman, is attracted and has no conflicts. The woman, also believing Hoffman to be a woman (though he is not), is riddled with conflict about her own sexual identity. The film becomes a marvelous study of confusion in the midst of clarity, with everybody re-exploring themselves in a not always painless situation. May I mention that painful exploration of one's identity is simply called "growth."

The NFB experience is a painful, soul-searching one. In a unique way it asks blind persons to re-examine their identity. The traditional negative and limited attitudes of society toward blind persons can easily become part of a blind person's self-image. A low level of expectation, a sense of inadequacy, among other negative aspects of self-image, are feelings with which we are all deeply familiar. In many ways the low self-image that has been forced on many blind persons is not very much different from the limited self-image with which many women have been indoctrinated. NFB is blind persons helping other blind persons to reject the myth that blindness is synonymous with incompetence. We learn that the proverbial "world of darkness" in which blind people supposedly live is a figment of the imagination, created by those with a mediocre sense of poetry, and a distorted view of life. The NFB experience is effective high drama! Its message does change lives on a very individual basis.



"Tootsie" brings to the fore a key issue in the relationship between blind and sighted persons. One may ask if Tootsie was really a man and if it was his personality, although in drag, that motivated women to greater independence. Would it have been impossible for a real woman to have achieved this? Or, put in other terms, is there something so unique that sighted people, and only sighted people, can teach blind persons? The answer is a simple one: The fact that Tootsie is a character in drag is irrelevant to most of this movie. It is only helpful in introducing comic relief to a movie that would otherwise be very heavy and commercially unsuccessful.

Each minority group has its own heroes. People who, in their day to day life, achieve moments of greatness because they reject the artificial limitations which social attitudes have created. In the Jewish community until the nineteenth century it was the belief that men should devote themselves to a rather limited number of fields. They were either scholars or merchants. Certainly few were farmers, and fewer were athletes. Of course, if you were not allowed to own land, it was hard to be a farmer and if you were restricted from attending major universities, there was little to encourage athletic excellence. Therefore, agriculture and athletics were not part of the self-image of the Jewish male. In 1981 "Chariots of Fire" was acclaimed "Best Motion Picture of the Year." Its heroes were olympic runners, the two greatest of which were Harold Abrahams, a Jewish male, and Eric Little, a Scottish preacher, both of whose backgrounds had not taught them that being an athlete was in their natural bent. The blind of this country

have produced from within the ranks brilliant leadership because the seed of greatness knows no vision barrier. I have in mind now a man who grew up in rural Tennessee, attended a school for the blind, was exposed to every traditional put-down that a blind person should not have to endure, and yet rose through his gifts of mind and spirit to become the nation's most outstanding leader of the blind—our President, Dr. Kenneth Jernigan.

It was just this past October that President Jernigan was welcomed by the Board of Trustees of The Jewish Braille Institute of America at our headquarters in New York. He shared with our leadership his observations of the past and his hopes for the future. This was not Kenneth Jernigan's first visit to the JBI—he came as a friend of many years renewing a warm, deep relationship between The Jewish Braille Institute and the organized blind of this nation. Our President, Dr. Jane Evans, extended to him then and she does to you today, through me, her prayers that through the will of God and strivings of people of good will—we shall, indeed, overcome.

### JB

I want to take a moment to report to you on what I think has been a most exciting year at The Jewish Braille Institute of America. Many of you are familiar with our agency and others are not. I hope that all who wish to use our services will get to know us well.

To begin with, The Jewish Braille Institute of America is not the most descriptive name. One-third of those who use our services are not Jewish. Although we have an extensive Braille library, most who use our services are

not Braille readers. As for the "of America" part of our name, in 1982 we provided materials to blind people in 43 countries of the world. So now you know all about why we are called The Jewish Braille Institute of America. Our agency's program is publishing materials of Jewish interest in Braille, talking book, and large print format. In 1982 our Braille library went over the 5,000 mark, contained in 65,000 volumes in English and Hebrew Braille. The Talking Book Library reached the 6,000 title mark contained in just under 100,000 tapes and cassettes, and our library of large print materials, though small, began to grow at a more vigorous pace, and I believe our libraries for the blind might be the largest in existence in a specialized field of study. We published ten issues of The Jewish Braille Review, a magazine of international circulation, now in its 53rd year. It was one of the pioneering magazines that met the needs of the intellectual blind, never falling into the "Dick and Jane" syndrome of child-like reading books. Seven years ago the Voice began publication. It is primarily for the non-Braille reading blind and contains similar material to The Jewish Braille Review, but on flexible disc format. We also continued publishing Or Chadash, a magazine on blindness-related issues, which we distribute on cassettes in the Hebrew language to the blind of Israel.

A major programmatic thrust in 1982 and early 1983 has been to increase services to those blind and visually impaired persons with some limited usable vision. We have launched a major program to establish hundreds of volunteer groups to produce books and other

written materials in large type. These groups will build our library while they meet student needs and other needs in their local communities.

I am pleased to announce today that The Jewish Braille Institute of America will be establishing a model low-vision clinic in Tel Aviv, Israel, which will be affiliated with the largest municipal medical center in that country. It will be a low-vision clinic not built on the denial of blindness but on the maximum utilization of residual vision, in addition to the acquisition of new skills when visual acuity is not useful. By establishing this facility at a medical center we help insure that the clinic's work will be of the highest quality.

The Jewish Braille Institute of America has remained active in the field of community education, providing positive perspectives on blindness to audiences throughout the country, including schools, civic organizations, and professionals in the field of community service. However, what I believe our crowning achievement has been as an agency is that all services, from the low-vision clinic to each and every book and recording produced, have come into existence because blind persons have asked for them. Every title we produce is done on demand, and with very few exceptions we have been able to fulfill each request. We consider ourselves to be, within our field of Judaic study, a resource to blind persons in their quest for religious, intellectual, and cultural enfranchisement. Over recent years, the Board of Trustees of The Jewish Braille Institute of America has expanded to include greater numbers of blind and visually impaired persons who share a healthy peer relationship with

sighted members of the Board. We abhor the negative aspects of the myth of consumerism. Rather than consumerism, we advocate equality, which unlike consumerism, creates no built-in distinctions of "us and them." In this building toward a positive today, and an even more exciting tomorrow, we share with the National Federation of the Blind, a crystal-clear concept of what the future must be.

For in just the few days we have been meeting here at this convention—somewhere a blind child has been born. And

we, through spirit and resolution, have made a commitment to that child—a promise that we shall continue to do all within our power to right wrongs, create opportunities, and care deeply for one another.

We hold as precious the future of that child who we hope will be among us at a convention perhaps twenty or thirty years from now. And we shall listen as that child speaks, telling us that we have won and all our dreams have come true.

## CONCERNING MEMBERS, ASSOCIATES, AND CONTESTS

by Kenneth Jernigan

In 1978 the NFB Constitution was amended to provide for "members-at-large" at the national level. These members-at-large were given the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities as any other member of the Federation at the national level—that is, they may attend the National Convention, speak on the floor, make motions, make nominations, participate in discussions carried on by the delegation from their state, and serve on committees. As is the case with any other member, they do not have an individual vote at the National Convention since votes are cast by elected delegates from the state affiliates. The national "members-at-large" are eligible to participate in the hospitalization and life insurance program conducted by the Federation. In other words they have a real and meaningful membership. Unless they specif-

ically join a state or local affiliate, they are not members of the affiliate and have no more rights in the affiliate than any other nonmember of the affiliate. They are national members-at-large.

National "members-at-large" must fill out a membership application form and pay an assessment of \$1 per year to the national treasury to keep their membership in force. Each year a new application form must accompany the \$1 assessment. Any application form dated, received, and accepted at the Treasurer's office or the National Office in Baltimore before October 1 will entitle the applicant to membership for the remainder of that calendar year. Any application form dated, received, and accepted at the Treasurer's office or the National Office after October 1 entitles the person to membership for the remainder

of that calendar year and all of the following calendar year. Members of the Federation who recruit national "members-at-large" should make certain that the name and full address of the member-at-large are legibly printed or typed in the appropriate place on the application form. In addition, the name and the state of the person doing the recruiting should be clearly printed or typed in the place on the form which says "local representative of the National Federation of the Blind." This is absolutely necessary if the recruiter is to receive credit for enrolling the member-at-large.

All members of state and local affiliates are members of the National Federation of the Blind. A majority of the voting members of an affiliate must be blind, but some affiliates require that 2/3 or 3/4 of the voting members be blind. A few affiliates require that all voting members be blind. Sometimes (either because voting membership is limited to blind persons, or because the quota of sighted voting members has been filled, or for some other reason) affiliates admit sighted persons as Associate members. (Associate members of affiliates should not be confused with the recently established "Associates" program involving national members-at-large.) By virtue of membership in an affiliate (whether associate membership or voting membership) an individual automatically becomes a member of the National Federation of the Blind, with the right to attend national conventions, speak on the floor, make motions, make nominations, participate in discussions carried on by the state delegation, and serve on committees. As has already been noted, the state has one

vote at the National Convention, and the state affiliate determines who the voting delegate will be and how the vote will be cast.

All members of the National Federation of the Blind (whether national members-at-large, Associate members of affiliates, or regular members of the affiliate) should make contributions to support the national movement. Increasingly members of affiliates are joining the Pre-Authorized Check (PAC) Plan, whereby a specified amount is withdrawn monthly from the member's bank account and deposited in the national treasury. Members of affiliates also make direct donations to the national treasury, as do the affiliates themselves. These donations are credited to the appropriate state and are included in the totals when the states are ranked according to the amounts they have contributed.

The "Associates" program has been established to encourage contributions from national members-at-large. Members of the Federation are trying to recruit as many new national members-at-large as possible and to get these members-at-large to become "Associates." A membership application form (a copy appears at the end of this article) should be filled out each year for each national member-at-large, and the amount which is being contributed should be noted on the form. Each year there is a contest to see who can recruit the largest number of "Associates." The contest runs from June 1 to May 31 of the following year.

The person who brings in the largest number of Associate contributions to the National Federation of the Blind will be the winner. Those associate contributions which come into the office of the



Treasurer in Kansas City or the National Office in Baltimore from June 1 to May 31 of the following year will be counted for that year's contest. Associates received after May 31 will count for the next year's contest. The May 31 deadline will allow time for the contest results to be computed before the National Convention. The contest winners will be announced at the National Convention. The first prize will be \$1,000; the second prize will be \$500; the third prize will be \$200; and the fourth prize will be \$100.

The goal of the NFB "Associates" program is to bring in much needed funds for our movement. Contributions of any size are welcomed and appreciated and may be sent in with the membership application form. People who give \$1 or more for any given year will be considered members-at-large of our organization. People who give a total of more than \$1 but less than \$10 are not only members-at-large but are, of course, also contributors. However, they are not (see the application form) "Associates." They do not count in calculating the totals for the contest.

Each "Associate" (that is, each contributor of \$10 or more) will count in the contest. Not only individuals but organizations may make associate contributions. For instance, a Neighborhood Club may make a contribution in the name of the Club instead of in the name of an individual.

Periodically "Associates" will receive educational mailings from the National Office. Associates contributing between \$10 and \$99.99 will receive a card of acknowledgement from the National Office, and those contributing \$100 or more will receive a certificate.

If a form reaches the Treasurer's office or the National Office and does not have the name of the recruiter on it, the person who did the recruiting will not get credit for the Associate. Once the form has been received, the name of the recruiter will not be added, even if the recruiter or the Associate contacts the National Office. This will give everyone an equal opportunity and seems the fairest way to proceed. If the form does not contain the name of the recruiter, the credit will be given to the state listed as the Associate's place of residence. From time to time the states are ranked as to how many Associates they have recruited. This does not involve the contest but is a matter of interest and recognition for the states. Either the recruiter or the Associate may send in the form.

Before 1983 on the second Monday in November of each year an educational mailing was sent from the National Office to all Associates. This mailing included a membership application form and a request that the individual sign up to continue as a member and an Associate for the coming year. Associates were asked (if they cared to do so) to fill in the name of the Federationist who recruited them, or they could fill in the name of any other Federationist that they wished to have the credit for their renewal.

Beginning with 1983, we will not make a mailing from the National Office on the second Monday of November to request national members-at-large to sign up for the coming year and become Associates. Instead, we will send to each recruiter mailing labels for all of the Associates credited to him or her for the previous contest year and who have not renewed



for the coming year. Mailing labels for members-at-large (Associates) who have not been credited to individual recruiters will be sent to the individual in each state designated as the chairperson for Associates for that state. By this system recruiters can personally contact their own lists and urge them to renew as members and Associates. Associates who live in the state but are not credited to any recruiter can be contacted by the state affiliate in whatever way it chooses. This should bring better results than the system we were formerly using.

We have now established the practice that each state will appoint a chairperson for the recruitment of Associates. It is important that the person so appointed be active and energetic, not only in doing personal recruiting but also in stimulating and coordinating the work of others throughout the state. The affiliate may wish to ask each local chapter to appoint a chairperson for Associates. It is urgent that we increase our level of activity in this vital program.

If the name of a Federationist appears on the renewal application, that person will receive credit for the renewal in the contest. Put it this way: If you get 40 Associate contributions for our movement for a given year and 20 of those contributors renew their membership for the following year, all of them who sign your name to the form will count as Associates you have brought in for the contest. If five of them forget to fill in your name, then these will not count for you in the contest. (One reason for this rule is that if the National Office tries to track down the recruiting Federationist for every un-

signed contribution, various Federationists will receive an unfair advantage, because the names of their relatives and friends would be easily recognized.) Of course, one way to solve this problem is to write your name on the form as the recruiter before you give it to the person you are trying to recruit or to persuade to renew his or her membership.

If a person makes more than two Associate contributions to the National Federation of the Blind between June 1 and the following May 31, only two contributions will be counted toward the contest in the Federationist's name. Thus, if John Smith makes one contribution for 1983 and one for 1984, both may be counted toward the 1983-84 contest, if the forms arrive before May 31, 1984.

Members of state and local affiliates should not make their contributions through the "Associates" program. They should join the PAC Plan or simply make donations to the National Office. The "Associates" program is designed to provide a way for national members-at-large to make contributions.

If two Federationists bring in the same number of Associates, the one bringing in the larger amount of money will be ranked higher. If Federationists recruit the same number of Associates and also, thereby bring in the same amount of money, they will be ranked alphabetically.

Our experience has been that the November mailing has not worked. It has resulted in only ten percent or so of Associates renewing their membership. This is why we are changing to the plan of sending mailing labels to individual recruiters and state affiliates. Personal contact or a letter with your name at the bottom always works best! There

is not a contest for states, but some state presidents are making friendly wagers with other state presidents, and many affiliates are voting to award a prize to the Federationist within the state who gets the most Associate contributions. Also, individual Federationists are challenging each other—sometimes, I hear, with friendly wagers. All Federationists who bring in Associate contributions will be receiving various colors of associate ribbons at next year's National Convention. See to it that your state has plenty of Associate ribbons proudly displayed next year!

Contests are fun, but the "Associates" program is serious and important business. It is possibly as vital as the very survival of our movement. Our opponents are desperately trying to block our path to independence. They know that if they can strangle us financially, they can make us ineffective.

The members of the movement are currently giving approximately \$250,000 through the PAC Plan, and we can and will do even more. However, if we are to continue to publish the Monitor, distribute Presidential releases on cassette, conduct seminars, produce and distribute materials, carry on civil rights cases, operate our Washington office, provide help and information to individuals and affiliates throughout the country, produce public service announcements, do legal research, recruit new members, evaluate and promote new aids and appliances, combat discrim-

ination in insurance and/or the airlines, and do all of the other things which make of our movement the force which it is for bettering the lives of the blind, we must find more money. We must ask our families, our friends, and the members of the public-at-large to join with us. We must recruit them as members and Associates. If our organization is really meaningful to us, each of us must help finance it. This year's National Convention underlined and emphasized the fact that we can and will. No force on earth (no American Foundation for the Blind, no NAC, no public misunderstandings and misconceptions, no group or combination) can do it. It is not simply a catch-phrase when we say: We know who we are, and we will never go back!

We understand the implications of what we are saying, and we mean it—every word of it. One way in which every individual member of the Federation can give form and substance to his or her faith in the movement is by recruiting Associates. It cannot be done by only a few. We are a people's movement, and we either have broad participation or we are nothing. The goal for the Associates program should be at least to equal the income from the PAC Plan. If you want membership application forms to recruit Associates, contact your local or state president or write the National Office at 1800 Johnson Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21230. Here is a reprint of the form:

# NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

## MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

The National Federation of the Blind has chapters in all fifty states and in almost every local community in the nation. The Federation has more than 50,000 members and is working to help the blind to have full and meaningful lives. It is not financed by the government but depends for support on contributions from its Members, and its Friends.

I support the National Federation of the Blind and herewith pay one dollar for Membership-at-large in the organization. As a Member-at-large I wish to make a tax-deductible contribution for the year \_\_\_\_\_ in the amount of:

- ☐ Associate—\$10
- ☐ Contributing Associate—\$25
- ☐ Supporting Associate—\$50
- ☐ Sponsoring Associate—\$100
- ☐ Sustaining Associate—\$500
- ☐ Member of the President's Club—\$1,000
- ☐ Other

(Please type or print legibly.)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Representative of the National Federation of the Blind:

(Name) \_\_\_\_\_ (State) \_\_\_\_\_

This application and accompanying check made payable to **National Federation of the Blind** should be sent to:

Richard Edlund, Treasurer  
National Federation of the Blind  
1800 Johnson Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21230

## RECEIPT



Received of \_\_\_\_\_

the amount of \_\_\_\_\_ dollars. Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature of representative of the National Federation of the Blind*

(All contributions to the National Federation of the Blind are tax-deductible.)

**BLINDNESS: THE OTHER HALF OF INERTIA**

An Address Delivered By

**KENNETH JERNIGAN**

PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
AT THE BANQUET OF THE ANNUAL CONVENTION

Kansas City, Missouri, July 7, 1983

An essential component of being human is the ability to think; an essential component of the ability to think is the ability to verbalize; and an essential component of the ability to verbalize is a knowledge of the meaning of words. It is not that a knowledge of the meaning of words can make us human or create humanity, but to the extent we lack such knowledge our humanity is diminished. To the extent we have it our humanity is enhanced. And it is not simply the speaking but the understanding of words that counts—the delineation of the subtleties of meaning, the comprehension of definition and connotation, the flow of imagery and association: love ... hate ... poverty ... longing ... loneliness ... desire ... dream. Words—the building blocks of humanity.

There are words for every occasion—words for children, words for scientists, and words for statesmen. There are also words which have special significance for us. Consider, for instance, the word inertia. What does it mean? What does it connote? And why does it have special significance? When most of us think of inertia, we think of something not moving, something inert—and it is not just the physical but also the social. The dictionary tells us that inertia means "lack of skill, idleness, laziness."

But this is only half of the meaning. There is the other half. The full definition is this: Things at rest tend to remain at rest, and things in motion tend to remain in motion, at a uniform rate and in a straight line. The only way to change the inertia of an object is by pressure. It is as hard to stop something which is moving as it is to start something which is not.

When the blind came to organize in 1940, the situation was about as bad as it could possibly be. It was almost static. It was worse than static, for there was enough motion to tantalize but not enough to encourage or stimulate hope. At the pace of 1940 it would have taken generations (perhaps centuries) for the blind to achieve meaningful lives and real opportunity—and a promise which is measured by centuries is no promise at all. It is only a shadow and a mockery. More than twenty years ago, in their struggle for recognition and freedom, the blacks (that minority with whom we have so often compared ourselves) said it all: "If not now, when!"

Regardless of the future, the world of 1940 held little hope for the blind—certainly none for the blind of that generation. It was custody, control, condescension, inferiority, pity, and lack of opportunity.

Then, everything changed. Dr. Jacobus

tenBroek and a handful of others organized the National Federation of the Blind. Suddenly it was not centuries but decades—and, yes, something for the blind of that generation, something for the blind then alive. In the beginning the force of inertia worked against us (things at rest tend to remain at rest); but pressure was applied, and the acceleration was noticeable and immediate. Of course, at first the progress was slow (it always is). The situation was aggravated by the mass involved, for with a given pressure the build-up is always in direct proportion to the mass which has to be moved. And the mass which we had to move was tremendous. It was all of society—all of it (including ourselves): society—with its accumulated stereotypes, misconceptions, and prejudices; society—with its mistaken ideas and "freaky" notions about blindness going back to the dawn of history, ideas and notions imbedded in literature, locked in folklore, and sanctified by tradition.

I joined this movement in 1949. I met Dr. tenBroek in 1952, and I came to my first National Convention the same year. I have been to every National Convention since—all thirty-two of them; and I can tell you from firsthand experience that during that time we have moved an awful lot of mass.

Now, we are in 1983. What is our situation today? Where are we? How is the state of our inertia? In the first place we should keep in mind the basic principle: The only way to change the inertia of an object is by pressure. It is as hard to stop something which is moving as it is to start something which is not. That is the rule, and it is as immutable for organizations as for

objects. By the terms of inertia no pressure is ever lost. For forty-three years we have worked and struggled to accelerate our movement and send it in a straight line toward freedom and independence. The efforts of tens of thousands of blind men and women have been spent for almost two generations to reach the current momentum. Today we are moving with a mighty force. It would take as much pressure and effort to stop our progress and push us back to 1940 as it has taken to get us where we are. I find that a comforting thought, for there is no force on earth that can do it. There is no group (no combination of groups) that can find the nerve, muster the determination, or feel the need. We can summon the strength to resist any conceivable pressure which would slow our acceleration and push us back—for we have experienced pain. We know what it is to hurt. Through the centuries we have yearned for acceptance; longed for opportunity; and dreamed of a full life. And too often we have waited. But no more! Never again! The waiting did not work. We have learned our lesson—and learned it well. Equality will not (perhaps cannot) be given to us. If we want it, we must take it. So the waiting is over. The yearning and the longing are at an end. And not just someday or tomorrow—but now! From this day forward it will be action. Let people call us what they will and think what they please. We are simply no longer willing to be second-class citizens. We want no strife or confrontation, but we will do what we have to do. To the extent required we will meet pressure with pressure and force with force. We know who we are, and we will never go back.

Today we are not in 1940, nor will we



ever be there again. Neither have we arrived at our goal. We are in mid-passage. The balances are shifting, and the force of inertia is now more with us than against us. We are moving with accelerating motion in a straight line toward the future, but there are counter pressures—forces of opposition, which seek to slow us down and push us back.

Upon superficial examination it might appear that we are not dealing with one group, but three: the general public, the governmental and private agencies, and ourselves. In a sense this is true, but both the blind and the agencies are part of the larger society, and to the extent we move society as a whole, we also move the component parts. This is so despite the fact that the sheltered shops, the rehabilitation establishment, and the other governmental and private agencies have a heavy investment in the status quo and, thus, a built-in resistance to change. They may come kicking and screaming—but they will come. We the blind are also part of the general public, and even though we are the primary force generating the change and creating the acceleration, we cannot outdistance the inertia we give to the rest of society.

Things at rest tend to remain at rest, but today that half of inertia is not our major concern. The focus is on the other half: things in motion tend to remain in motion. With growing pressure we are accelerating toward the goal of security, equality, and opportunity for the blind. Although our overall momentum is increasing rapidly, the progress is not uniform. In some areas it is steady; in others it is exponential; in still others it is uneven; and in yet others it is hardly noticeable at all.

We have made much progress, but we still have a long way to go. The mistaken notions and ancient stereotypes which people have about blindness are all pervasive. They are so ingrained as to be almost second nature. They go to the central core of our being and permeate every shade of our simplest thought. This is true of the blind as well as the sighted. Sometimes those of us who are blind (even those of us who consciously work on a daily basis to change the status quo) accept the public view of our limitations, without even knowing we are doing it. Sometimes we do it while in the very act of speaking to the contrary.

A few years ago I went to a cafeteria with a sighted associate. We took our trays and moved down the line. When we turned from the cash register and started for the table, an accident occurred. A glass of water fell from the tray and splashed on the floor. "There will be those," I said, "who will see this and think the reason I spilled that glass of water is because I am blind."

"You are right," my sighted associate replied; "for you didn't spill it. I did. It fell from my tray, not yours."

What I have already told you is bad enough, but there is more, and worse. I didn't leave it there: "How did you do that?" I asked.

This time my associate (who is as well versed in our philosophy as the rest of us) responded with more than a touch of acid: "I did it the same way anybody else would," she said. "I tipped my tray. Do you think it is normal for the blind to be clumsy and the sighted to be graceful? Do you think sighted people don't have accidents? Why did you automatically assume that you were the one

who spilled the water?"

It was a fair question, and it caused a lot of soul searching. I reluctantly conclude that (despite all of my philosophy and knowledge to the contrary, despite all of my experience with this very sort of situation dressed out in other forms) I fell into the trap of social conditioning. I hope I won't do it again, but I can't be sure. The force of inertia is powerful, and changes in public attitudes about blindness are hard to set in motion. Things at rest tend to remain at rest.

The blind are like other minorities. Some of us have come a long way on the road to equality; others have only started; and many have not yet begun. The plain truth is that (because of low self esteem and the role society has taught us to play) a lot of blind people, along with most of the sighted, simply do not believe that it is respectable to be blind. Mainly such people are not in this organization (at least, not actively in it), for we are moving on a different track. We have tested our theories and put them to the proof. The basic tenet of our philosophy can be stated in a single sentence: the average blind person (given reasonable opportunity and an even break) can make the dollars and take the knocks with everybody else.

In April of this year Fred Schroeder, who is one of our coming young leaders, represented the Federation at a meeting involving a number of officials from the governmental and private agencies. One of the occurrences which he reported has particular relevance to what we are discussing: "During lunch on Thursday," he said, "I observed an incident which brought into vivid clarity the way in

which these folks view themselves as blind people. Mr. Y, who is blind, had joined the group for lunch and was sitting next to Mr. X, who is also blind. I overheard Mr. Y say, 'I have been sitting next to you for ten minutes, and I still don't know whether you are blind or sighted.' With obvious pleasure Mr. X responded, 'Why, thank you very much. I'm blind.'"

What a damning commentary. He thought it was a compliment! This man works with the newly blinded. He serves, if only by example, as a role model of what blind people can do and expect to be. No wonder it has taken us so long to achieve momentum! Last fall I, too, had occasion to observe Mr. X. He chaired a meeting which I attended, and when it came time for a pause, he said something to this effect: "There are coffee and rolls in the back of the room. We are not going to take a break just yet, but if you like, those of you who can see can go back during the next couple of minutes and get refreshments."

If this attitude of low self esteem is held by the agency leaders (and it is not just the blind who hold it but often the sighted as well), how do they treat the blind they are employed to help? Many of you in this room do not need documentation to tell you. You know firsthand from painful experience. But the documentation exists. All too frequently, I am sad to say, the agency officials express their feelings of frustration and inadequacy by taking the tack (of course, they do not do it consciously) that if they cannot succeed in business or achieve leadership anywhere else, at least they can bully and dominate the blind.

Consider, for instance, the following

letter which I recently received from a blind adult who had attended a camp for the blind in California called Enchanted Hills. "The director and staff," he said, "can stay up as late as they wish—smoke, drink, make noise, and keep the campers up. The campers, on the other hand, can't drink, smoke, or make noise—and we have a curfew. We are adults like they are, and just because we're blind, they think they have the say—so over us."

As you can see, Enchanted Hills is far from idyllic; but it is a model of freedom compared to the Northeastern Association of the Blind at Albany, New York—which (with the help of state and federal funds) operates a rehabilitation training program. Under date of May 17, 1983, our New York President (David Stayer) wrote to the Executive Director of the Northeastern Association as follows:

"Dear Mr. Friedman,

"It has been brought to the attention of our organization that you operate a residential facility for blind adults. We have heard that the residents are not treated as adults, and their dignity is nonexistent. As President of our New York Affiliate, I am specifically requesting the written policy clearly explaining all the rules and regulations related to your residence, Doc's Motel. I am also requesting the statement of rights that the residents have....

"If what we hear is valid, your agency is a disgrace for the way it treats those of us who are blind. It is reported that adults are ordered to bed right after dinner, that specific permission must be obtained before a resident is allowed to leave the motel, and

that a ten p.m. curfew exists."

Mr. Friedman responded under date of May 27, 1983. His letter should be studied with care by those who say we exaggerate when we talk about custodialism. He is so out of touch with reality that he does not even know what he is admitting. Yet, his attitudes are closer to the norm than the exception. Here is what he says:

"Dear Mr. Stayer:

"Your concern about the treatment of blind adults is one that is shared by everyone at this association. We are concerned that all individuals are treated in a dignified manner.

"You refer to our operation of a residential facility for blind adults. This is incorrect. Doc's Motel is separate and apart from the area in which certain blind individuals reside. While it is true that the boarding host is the proprietor of a motel, the individuals residing with her live in her home, not in the motel proper. It is also untrue that adults are ordered to bed right after dinner. A 10:00 p.m. curfew exists only in the sense that individuals are expected to respect the rights of others beginning at that time. Quiet hours begin then and usually last until the early morning hours....

"In general we expect residents to interact effectively as adults residing in the same situation. However, as a result of experiential deprivation, the existence of other handicapping conditions in addition to legal blindness, and a certain amount of social immaturity, this is not always a realistic expectation. The guidelines were developed to protect the basic rights of

the individuals residing at the boarding home, in which are provided clean, comfortable, quiet places to sleep and three meals each day...Access to any other portions of the boarding host's property (aside from common eating areas at appropriate times and bedroom facilities) is on a voluntary basis.

"With regard to the imposition of quiet hours, it is reasonable to expect that trainees who are participating in a full-time day training program usually require as a minimum eight hours of sleep per night. Thus, quiet hours are from 10 p.m. to 6:30 a.m. on Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday nights. Quiet hours of twelve midnight to 8:30 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights have been established. Should an individual wish to remain outside of his or her bedroom area after ten p.m. on week nights and after twelve p.m. on weekends, the individual is free to do so. However, the individual is not permitted to return to the bedroom area until the end of quiet hours. In the case of week nights, this is 6:30 a.m., and in the case of weekends this is 8:30 a.m. Thus, no curfew as such exists. An individual can be required to return to the bedroom area after the taking of the evening meal. However, as I have previously mentioned, no individual has ever been ordered to bed or to sleep at that time....

"All current residents are aware of these guidelines and rules, and each has agreed to sign a copy of the rules and guidelines when the final draft is completed.

"Mr. Stayer, it is unfortunate that an individual who feels that he or she has been mistreated by our association would not seek justice to redress the alleged

violations of his dignity as a human being within the agency that is providing services to him or her....

"For the past seventy-five years the Northeastern Association of the Blind at Albany has worked with members of the blind community in assisting them to achieve their maximum potential and independence within the framework of the services we offer.

"I look forward to the time when we all can work constructively for the individuals about whom we are rightfully concerned.

"Sincerely,

"Michael B. Friedman

"Executive Director"

Remember that this exchange of correspondence is less than two months old. A young blind woman wants training to be a secretary, so she goes to the Northeastern Association for help. And what does she find? The Association is "concerned that all individuals are treated in a dignified manner." Mr. Friedman tells us so. Furthermore, it is not a residential facility for blind adults—because Doc's Motel is separate and apart from the area in which certain blind individuals reside (and besides, they do not live in the motel proper). A 10:00 p.m. curfew exists only in the sense that individuals are expected to respect the rights of others beginning at that time, presumably being free to violate such rights at 9:59 and before. And what is all of this talk about restriction? Residents are not required to be in their rooms by ten on week nights and twelve on weekends. Well, of course, if they happen to be late, they can't come back until the next day. They can,



one assumes, sleep wherever the party was—or in the park. Probably it will decrease their "experiential deprivation" and lessen their "social immaturity."

Then, there is the matter of ordering people to their rooms after dinner. Not true. Well, all right—perhaps they are ordered to their rooms, but no one has been ordered to bed or to sleep. Can you believe it? How on earth would you order someone to sleep if you wanted to? But, not to worry—"For the past seventy-five years the Northeastern Association of the Blind at Albany has worked with members of the blind community in assisting them to achieve their maximum potential and independence within the framework of the services we offer." In fact, doubly not to worry. The Northeastern Association of the Blind at Albany is accredited. By whom? You guessed it—by that advocate of high standards and quality services, NAC (the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped). The accreditation is assured until 1986.

And, anyway, the trainees will sign a statement agreeing to the rules. They have already approved them, even before the final draft has been written. Mr. Friedman says so. To conclude this sorry business, let me give you just one brief quote from Mr. Friedman's rules:

"The resident," the document says, "has the individual right to occupy his bedroom and store his belongings within the bedroom. Each individual is also permitted to allow other residents to enter or exit. If the individual wishes to carry on private and personal conversations with individuals of his or her choice, he or she may do so. He or she is not obligated to allow entrance to

any other parties, with the exception of the boarding host or any person assigned as a supervisory figure."

I don't know how all of that strikes you—but I, for one, would starve before I would take training from that organization. Doc's Motel is not on the roster of places I intend to visit—unless, of course, I go there to picket (which, incidentally, I may). The Northeastern Association of the Blind at Albany is exactly the kind of organization we intend to reform or put out of action. Perhaps we can teach them something about the other half of inertia. Things at rest can be put into rapid motion if you apply enough force and pour on the pressure. We want no strife or confrontation, but we will do what we have to do—and we don't intend to be sent to our rooms after dinner or kept off the premises until 8:31 on Sunday morning or badgered about our "experiential deprivation." We are simply no longer willing to be second-class citizens. We know who we are, and we will never go back.

Bad as all of this is, we must keep it in perspective. The agencies are not (and cannot be) our principal area of focus. Regardless of their delusions of grandeur and their talk about professionalism and expertise, they do not set the tone. They are merely subordinate parts of the larger society. Their attitudes spring—not from knowledge or "professionalism," as they claim—but from the prejudice and misconceptions of the general public. When we have educated that general public and imparted to it enough momentum to send it accelerating toward first-class status for the blind, the agencies will follow.

And the task we face is formidable. Every day there are letters and articles



which cross my desk to prove it. The public attitudes about blindness are straight from the Middle Ages—including witchcraft, superstition, and fear of the dark. There is not a single area of human endeavor which is exempt. The ignorance extends from prison to pulpit, from sex to Sunday school, and from airlines to alcoholism. Do you doubt it?

A journalist from Ohio thinks the blind need special fishing facilities, and he writes me about it: "The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers," he says, "has built thousands of dams throughout the country and plans to build hundreds more. Many of these, such as the Ohio River navigational dams, have tailwaters that, for various reasons, attract millions of fish. These areas offer us a unique opportunity to develop quality fishing for those previously deprived of the experience by lack of sight or mobility."

A locksmith from Wisconsin believes the blind would benefit from specially shaped door knobs (oval and textured, he thinks), and he is willing to design them. These knobs would warn us of stairs and other so-called "danger areas." A pilot from Pennsylvania thinks we should solve the problems we have with airlines by setting up one of our own: segregated and simple—no more trouble, either for us or the sighted public. A woman from Tennessee thinks her blind daughter is unable to play with sighted children: "Lynn is a smart little girl," she writes, "and makes good grades. Since she can't play with other children, she has turned to books. We call her our little book worm."

Then, there is religion. Many people have enlightened attitudes about it, but a great many do not—and when they do

not, the blind come in for very special treatment. First, consider the gentle and compassionate. Not long ago the Augsburg Publishing House distributed a bulletin to the Lutheran Churches. It said in part: "To engage in a lively conversation with someone who is blind as if he is not blind is to honor him." I am sure that the sentiment was kindly meant, but not many of us would feel honored. How do you engage in a conversation with someone who is blind as if he is not blind? It is like engaging in a conversation with someone from Missouri as if he were not from Missouri.

But let us leave this subtle stuff and get to the fire and brimstone. Not long ago a woman from Des Moines wrote me and laid it out.

"I have never heard," she said, "of a Christian family having a blind child. The Lord Jesus Christ looks after His people. People are getting so wicked. God is chastising people for not following Him and doing His ways. Fifty years ago I never heard of blind people. Now there are so many. Hundreds of them. Why don't you all get saved? And then the Lord will heal your eyes if you ask Him to—or go have a minister pray for you."

That puts it on the line. Wouldn't you say? Now, I don't know how you read the scriptures, but that is not the way I read them. If the incidents I am relating were isolated happenings, I would not discuss them—but they are not. They occur on a daily basis, with monotonous frequency. They are the typical, the norm. I deal with hundreds and thousands of them in an ongoing pattern.

Here, for instance, is a letter which Ralph Sanders recently got. It is no less condescending than the one I just quoted, but perhaps it is a bit more

secular. "Ralph: to think you have been considered a second-class citizen when you have been required to sit in a certain pew disgusts me. Give the sighted some consideration. You count your footsteps and note your directions. Your pew was chosen for you to 'hear' the sermon. It is located where you don't stumble over some sleeping person's feet, and if you happen to really get the spirit during the sermon and forget the footsteps and directions, the person who told you where the best place was for you to sit will be able to identify you and give you companionship as soon as possible."

Yet, they tell us there is no discrimination and that we are not a minority. I have said it before, and I will say it again. We want no strife or confrontation, but we will do what we have to do. To the extent required we will meet pressure with pressure and force with force. We are simply no longer willing to be second-class citizens. We know who we are, and we will never go back.

As I have indicated, there are those who base the claim that we are inferior on religion, but there are also those who base it on science. Here is a case in point: "The blind," the writer declares, "can never be truly equal, because they cannot have any combination of senses to equal vision. For example, they cannot view the lives of microscopic organisms or analyze atomic structures by sight. The key to life itself is left unseen by them."

How many sighted people do you suppose this man thinks have ever seen an atom? And what about electrons and protons and neutrons? To quote Isaac Asimov, "As far as the protons and electrons are concerned, the neutrons can go jump in the

lake"—which is about the way I feel about the man who wrote that letter.

Pat Barrett is one of the leaders of the National Federation of the Blind of Idaho. Early this year he wrote me about Games magazine. Games is published by Playboy Press and has adult crossword puzzles. On the cover of the February, 1983, issue were colloquialisms expressed in the form of pictures. "Holy mackerel" was a fish with holes in it. "Blind as a bat" was a bat carrying a cup of pencils. As Pat said in his letter of protest to Playboy, "the idea that blind persons usually sell pencils on the street corner is outdated and shallow."

The notion that we are inferior is not limited to the everyday world. It penetrates every corner of existence. A prison inmate recently wrote to tell me that he would like to do recording for the blind. As he put it, "if I can help someone less fortunate than I am, I would like to do it."

In a slightly different vein a man wrote me last year to ask for my help concerning a friend who was in the penitentiary. "He is serving three years on theft of property charges stemming from several checks written for over \$100.00," the man said. "Prison is no place for a blind person, and I was wondering if you could intervene for an early parole."

A man in Minnesota thinks blind alcoholics cannot benefit from regular programs used by the sighted and suggests segregated services. The Manchester Union Leader (one of New Hampshire's most prominent newspapers) says that the governor of the state is so bad that only the deaf, the dumb, and the blind could believe he is competent. Hazel

Staley (one of the leaders of our North Carolina affiliate) was denied the right this year to take a tour with her church group through Cannon Mills.

Then, there is the battle which Don Capps had last year with the Hyland Therapeutics Division of Travenol Laboratories of Glendale, California. That organization pays people to participate in its plasmapheresis program. This is a high-toned way of saying that blood is taken from the person, plasma and other components are extracted from the blood, and the remaining portion of the blood is then injected back into the person's body. The laboratory took the position that blind persons were not capable of participating. Don Capps disagreed. "Dear Dr. Rodell," he wrote: "I must conclude from your letter that you know virtually nothing about blindness or blind people.... Whether you fully realize it or not, your remarks and the policy they imply are blatantly discriminatory.... You subtly imply that blind persons will inhibit or disturb the operation's safety.... You also mention that prospective donors are required to read a detailed Informed Consent Form and then sign it, indicating that the form has been read and understood.... If you will think for a moment, you must realize that blind patients undergoing surgery or medical treatment must also sign Informed Consent forms, as well as a variety of other contracts and legal papers in their lifetimes."

Dr. Rodell didn't like it, but he grudgingly began to give ground. He tried to delay. Under date of October 26, 1981, he wrote: "Since the processing of blind donors requires changes to be made in routine procedures, we are obligated to deny participation until

such procedural changes are made in an orderly, thoughtful, and constructive manner. I will instruct my staff to initiate appropriate action in that direction. I sympathize with your concerns relative to problems that are faced by blind persons, but strongly object to and do not agree with your conclusion that we are discriminating against them."

Don was not deterred. He kept at it. When Dr. Rodell (in a letter dated March 23, 1982) finally gave in and said he would accept the blind as donors, he got in as many nasty little licks as he could. In his special rules concerning the blind he said: "On the Donor Master Form, below the area for allergies, print in red BLIND or LIMITED-VISION so that the donor's needs are immediately recognized whenever he presents himself."

All of this gibbering insanity (this talk of blindness as an allergy, of oval shaped door knobs and segregated fishing facilities, of Christians not losing their sight and blind persons not being equal because of their inability to see atoms) could be chalked up to madness and soon forgotten—except for this: It translates into cruelty and pain and deprivation. It means lack of opportunity and denial of employment. It leads to broken lives and shattered dreams.

A blind man is denied the right to sell insurance because a company official believes his signature would not be valid. A blind mother in California has her children taken away from her because she is blind, and we have to go to court and the press to get them back. Sighted parents from Illinois tell of the treatment they got when their son became blind:

"Our son is sixteen years old," they write, "and went totally blind in May of 1980, after he was hit on the head in the hall at school. Family and friends quietly deserted us. Even now we are that family with the blind child, and our youngest son has been the target for ridicule and cruelty because of his 'stupid blind brother.'"

Sally Prentice is one of our members from Connecticut. She went to a job fair to seek employment. "In October of 1981," she writes, "I attended a job fair for the handicapped in Stamford, Connecticut. It was sponsored by the Easter Seal Center. Attending the fair were representatives of many large corporations, among them Xerox. Xerox was having its own business problems and was not hiring at the time. They did, however, take it upon themselves to offer me advice.

"I went to this job fair in good faith, believing that companies also sent representatives in good faith to recruit qualified disabled individuals. I went with my resume in hand (and I have reason to believe it is well done). I dressed in a skirt and blazer, the kind of thing anyone would be proud to wear to a job interview. I went alone, carrying my white cane and portfolio.

"I talked with three representatives from the Xerox personnel office at their booth. After a few moments of conversation, they informed me that they were not hiring and offered the following advice. They said that I was too self-assured, too articulate, and too effective. They advised me that it was obvious from my manner that if anyone were to 'give me a job,' I would not be 'grateful,' but would feel that I deserved it! They said that this attitude would hurt

me and that I should, therefore, try to appear more humble.

"It had never before occurred to me that anyone could think I wanted them to 'give me a job.' I was applying to be employed, and I know I have ability worth paying for. A gift can be many things. It can be given out of love or it can be given to the helpless and needy out of charity. I did not want love or charity from the Xerox Corporation. I might have deserved a job if I had received fair consideration. It was clear to me that no blind person could receive fair consideration from these people. They had set different standards for blind job applicants than for sighted ones.

"It may seem surprising, but I was thinking of the interviews I had when I was sighted. I got every job I ever interviewed for. I made a good impression, and employers were pleased to offer me a position. I do not believe that I should change my whole life style because I am blind. It's not good for me. It's not good for employers. It's not good for other blind people. We must find a way to make employers accept us for what we are. I was shaken by this experience, but I was not taken in by it. I am continuing to use the same techniques I have always used to seek employment."

Sally Prentice is a sensitive and intelligent human being. Her letter does more than speak of employment. It tells of a need which cries to be met. It talks of a people born to be free—and a spirit loose in the land. It calls the blind to joint action, and points the way to where we must go. It shows us the past and how far we have traveled. It looks to the future and the distance ahead. It demands and exhorts and en-



courages. It causes us to think of what we have been through the ages, of what we have become as a movement, and of what we certainly and surely intend to be.

Sally Prentice (and the rest of us like her) cannot be checked in our growing momentum. We have found the other half of inertia, and we are generating the force to make our dreams reality. The very fact of our Federation is the strongest proof of what I have said. Yes, we still experience discrimination, denial, and lack of opportunity; but the tide is running the other way. It can be seen in our victories in the sheltered shops, in our radio and television spots which blanket the nation, and in the jobs which blind people are getting and

holding. It can be seen in the hope, the determination, and the zest for the future which blind people now are feeling. It can be seen in the mood and the joy of this convention.

We have learned the truth of the other half of inertia: things in motion tend to remain in motion—and it is as hard to stop something which is moving as it is to start something which is not. We are moving! We are going with a mighty sweep, straight for equality and first-class status—and no force on earth can slow us down or turn us back or change our direction. My brothers and my sisters, the future is ours. Come! March with me in the quickening pace, and we will make it all come true!

## HAWAII AND CALIFORNIA RECEIVE CHARTERS

One of the highpoints of the banquet of the 1983 National Convention was the presentation of Charters. President Jernigan said:

"Chartering is a serious matter, and the presentation of this Charter is especially significant. It represents the history of this organization, and also the promise for the future. For quite some time in California we have been unable to use our own name. So we have called ourselves the National Federation of the Blind Western Division. No more! As of August 1, we resume our rightful name, the National Federation of the Blind of California. This Charter symbolizes a great deal. It has been signed. Sharon and I have signed it, and it is now officially executed.

And although we do not resume that name for a few more days, it is my pleasure at this banquet to give you (Sharon Gold, President of the National Federation of the Blind of California) this Charter, with all that it symbolizes. You have stood firm when it counted, and we as a national body have stood firm when it counted. This symbolizes our unity as one national organization, indivisible. Here is the Charter."

Sharon Gold, President of the California affiliate, received the Charter and responded to the presentation: "Thank you, Dr. Jernigan. President Jernigan, members of the national board, and my fellow Federationists: Five years ago we in California (and all of us across this nation) made a pledge.



We made a pledge to each other and to those who would threaten what we stand for. We said that we would not allow it—that is, anyone to come around and take away or attempt in any way to thwart our efforts as a movement. We have kept that pledge, all of us together. And, Dr. Jernigan, you have never been too busy; and you have always stood with us. We are very proud of you, Dr. Jernigan, because if it were not that we have the kind of National President that we have, we wouldn't have the kind of team that we have. We appreciate it."

President Jernigan said: "Sharon, we are proud of you—and proud of the organization we have in California. Let the whole world know it.

"Now I wish to present the other Charter of Affiliation. This Charter is being received by a comparatively new Federationist—one who until last month was not part of this movement. But one who is now very much part of it. Bill Smith has shown that he is a man of determination, of understanding—a man who is willing to accept a challenge and go forward with this organization as a valued member of the team, and also as a brother. Bill Smith, it is an honor and

a privilege to present to you as President of the National Federation of the Blind of Hawaii this visible symbol of our oneness with you and our brothers and our sisters in Hawaii. Here is the Charter of Affiliation for the National Federation of the Blind of Hawaii."

Bill Smith, the newly elected President of the National Federation of the Blind of Hawaii, came to the podium and said: "Dr. Jernigan, brothers and sisters: Aloha mahalo nai loa. It is with great humility that we accept and will carry this Charter. You can rest assured, brothers and sisters and Dr. Jernigan, that the torch will be carried by all of us from Hawaii. Aloha and mahalo nai loa again. God bless."

With these symbolic presentations the chartering of the states is complete. Now, in the Hall of Charters at the National Center for the Blind, fifty-one framed Charters (signed duplicate originals) hang on the wall. They tell the world (and they remind each of us as Federationists) that we are not a confederacy of fragmented separate organizations. We are one with each other and ourselves. We are the blind speaking for ourselves. We are the National Federation of the Blind.

## SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW SCHOLARSHIPS AND AN EXPANDED PROGRAM

For many years the National Federation of the Blind has been giving at its Annual Convention banquet the Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship, usually in the amount of \$1,200. This Scholarship

has gone to an individual majoring in law or the sciences. When Dr. Isabelle Grant died, she left money for two scholarships for women at the post secondary level. These were to be adminis-

tered by the National Federation of the Blind and were to be known as the Hermione Grant Calhoun Scholarships. From the beginning each scholarship has been in the amount of \$2,500. Like the Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship, the Hermione Grant Calhoun Scholarships have been given at the time of the convention banquet.

More recently we have been giving the Melva T. Owen Scholarship, to date in the amount of \$1,200. This scholarship, made possible by the Tarver Fund, is given in memory of Melva T. Owen, who was widely known and loved among the blind. She and her husband Charles Owen became acquainted with increasing numbers of blind people through their work in the "Voicependence" Club.

Thus, at the 1983 NFB convention banquet in Kansas City we gave four scholarships. The eight finalists were brought to the convention, and the decision as to who would be the winners was made the day before the banquet.

The winners of the Hermione Grant Calhoun Scholarships (each receiving \$2500) were Marianne Dearstyne and Lettie Jackson. Mrs. Dearstyne, who is from Pittsfield, Massachusetts, is an honor graduate of Pittsfield Community College. She is now studying at Smith College and intends to become an attorney. She first heard of the Federation because of our scholarship program. Although this was her first Convention, she has kept in contact with the Federation since that time and is quite excited about the movement.

Lettie Jackson is from Austin, Texas. She attends Austin Community College, where she is maintaining a grade point average of 3.86. She has held both local and state offices in the Federa-

tion. Her husband Aaron is also blind and is a student. Her goal is a degree in early childhood education with an emphasis on special education.

The Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship (\$1200) was won by Clyde Terry of Concord, New Hampshire. He has completed his first year at Franklin Pierce Law Center and is building an excellent record. He worked as a Consumer Advocate in the office of Boston's Mayor Kevin White, where he developed his interest in law. In recommending him, Theresa Herron (President of the NFB of New Hampshire and a newly elected member of the National Board) said: "I present his name with love and pride." Last summer Clyde biked across the country.

The Melva T. Owen Scholarship (\$1200) was won by Kimberly Gardner of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. At age 20 Miss Gardner was the youngest of the scholarship winners. She is interested in international corporate law and attends St. Joseph's University, where she is an honor student. She heard of the Federation because of the scholarship program, called NFB of Pennsylvania President Pat Comorato and talked with him for a long time, read our material, wrote the American Council of the Blind to find out what they were about, and decided to join the Federation, regardless of the outcome of her scholarship application. She became an active member, working on legislation in Harrisburg and attending the Wagner-O'Day hearings in Washington in May. She had already made plans to attend the national convention before learning she was a scholarship finalist.

These four were the winners of the 1983 scholarships, and excellent winners they were. However, there was a general feeling among the membership that the

scholarship program should be expanded. Accordingly, the National Board of Directors met by conference telephone in August and decided that at next year's national convention in Phoenix eight new \$2,500 scholarships will be given. This will be in addition to the two \$2,500 Hermione Grant Calhoun Scholarships and the Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship, which will also be raised to \$2,500. We are not sure of the amount of the Melva T. Owen Scholarship, but if it should remain at \$1,200, this will mean that we will be giving eleven \$2,500 scholarships and one \$1,200 scholarship. Applicants for the eight new scholarships must be studying (or plan to study) at the post secondary level.

To handle this increased workload, the Scholarship Committee is being restructured. We are not yet ready to make the announcement as to who will chair the Committee. However, it is not too early for interested students to write for information. Correspondence should be addressed to Scholarship Committee, National Federation of the Blind, 1800 Johnson Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21230. Appropriate application forms and material will be sent upon request.

These additional facts should be kept in mind: It is not necessary for an individual to belong to the Federation in order to be eligible to win a scholarship. However, it is necessary for the individual to contact a state or local officer of the Federation to dis-

cuss the scholarship program, and evidence must be presented that such contact has been made. The twenty finalists will be brought to the national convention in Phoenix during the first week in July 1984. If it is needed, financial assistance will be given to help them come to the convention. The scholarship winners will be selected from these twenty finalists the day before the presentations are made. Regardless of the outcome, the very fact of having been selected as a finalist is, of course, an honor and a recognition of excellence. Except for the restrictions which have already been mentioned concerning the Hermione Grant Calhoun Scholarships and the Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship, there are no restrictions as to field of study or sex in determining the winner of any of the scholarships. The donors of the Melva T. Owen Scholarship have said that, since they do not wish to become involved in doctrinal disputes, applicants for that scholarship must not be majoring in the field of religion. All applicants must be legally blind.

We believe that this expanded scholarship program can help blind persons achieve better lives. We would like for the news about it to be spread to every agency doing work with the blind, every college and university, and every interested blind person throughout the nation.

---

**SHARON GOLD RECEIVES JACOBUS TENBROEK AWARD**

---

The banquet at the Annual Convention of the National Federation of the Blind is always an occasion for exciting events. The 1983 banquet was no exception. The Jacobus tenBroek award is not presented each year but only occasionally. This year was such an occasion, and there was unanimous agreement that the recipient was richly deserving. As Master of Ceremonies (First Vice President Donald Capps) introduced the item, there were both tension and expectation. He said:

"At this time, it is my pleasure to present to you the Second Vice President of the National Federation of the Blind—a lady who is doing an outstanding job, not only in her native state of Colorado, but throughout the country as one of our national officers. Here is Mrs. Diane McGeorge, Second Vice President of the National Federation of the Blind, to present the Jacobus tenBroek Award."

Mrs. McGeorge spoke as follows: "Tonight it is our privilege to present the Jacobus tenBroek Award. Like the Newel Perry Award, the Jacobus tenBroek Award is to be granted only as often as distinguished accomplishment merits. Established in 1974, the presentation commemorates the exemplary lifestyle which our founding President, Dr. tenBroek, set for himself and all Federationists. It is intended only for a Federationist—a colleague in the movement—who (through dedication, sacrifice, and courage) has made an outstanding contribution toward the progress and independence of the blind. We are presenting the Jacobus tenBroek Award for

only the fourth time since its establishment. The Jacobus tenBroek Award Committee has identified a Federationist who possesses those special traits which distinguished Dr. tenBroek. Although tonight's recipient has been an active Federationist for less than ten years, during this comparatively short time span this individual has become totally committed to the movement and has demonstrated unusual strength of leadership. It is a great honor and a privilege to present this award to a front line soldier in the movement—our colleague and friend, Sharon Gold.

"We all know that as President of the National Federation of the Blind Western Division, Sharon was presented with the monumental task of re-establishing a viable affiliate in California. Sharon has spent countless hours, not only holding the affiliate together but also giving the kind of leadership which provided strength and encouragement for other California members, so that this affiliate has grown into one of our strongest.

"All of us here tonight know of Sharon's activities as a Federationist, but many are not aware of her other outstanding accomplishments. She taught school at Edwards Air Force Base for twenty years, was a foster parent for a number of years, and was an active 4-H leader. Her life has exemplified Federationism in action.

"Sharon, I now present to you this engraved plaque, which reads: 'National Federation of the Blind, Jacobus tenBroek Award—Presented to Sharon Gold, July 7, 1983: for your dedication,

---



commitment, and sacrifice on behalf of the blind of the nation. Your contributions must be measured, not in steps but by miles—not by individual experiences but by your impact on the lives of the blind of this generation. Whenever we have asked, you have answered. We call you our colleague with respect; we call you our friend with love."

Dr. Jernigan said: "Congratulations, Sharon! Congratulations!"

Sharon was obviously both surprised and deeply moved by the presentation. She said: "Thank you very much. Friends, my colleagues: I became active in this movement, I guess, for a variety of reasons—not the least of which was that I became concerned because my fellow Federationists (or my fellow blind and I, as a Federationist) were being kept from flying on airplanes. It drew me because I had been flying since ten years old—alone; and I knew that if the airline industry got its way, none of us would fly, and none of us would be free.

"When I became active in the movement, I learned something else though. I guess that all of us at one time or another think we do things on our own and that we make accomplishments on our own. I had been teaching for ten years or more when I became active in this movement. And I learned something that I think was very, very important to me. It was my fellow blind of California who went out and made it possible for the blind of California to get a teaching credential. It wasn't just random blind people. It was the National Federation of the Blind. And, because of the National Federation of the Blind, I've got a teaching credential—and I got a job. And, I got a job for one more reason. There was a committee in the early fif-

ties—which was chaired by our beloved President, Dr. Jernigan. That committee raised the consciousness of administrators towards blind teachers in California. Because of that very effort, while there were no blind teachers in the elementary and secondary schools in 1954 and '55, by 1960 there were almost two hundred blind teachers in the schools. By 1962 I was one of them. Were it not for the National Federation of the Blind, I wouldn't have had a job for twenty years. I thank all of my brothers and my sisters because none of us does any of it alone. It takes all of us to do every bit of it. Thank you very much. I appreciate this very, very much."

At the conclusion of Sharon's remarks First Vice President Capps said: "May we add our congratulations to Sharon Gold, as well. The tenBroek Award, of course, is a living memorial to the founder of this great National Federation of the Blind; and I think we would be remiss if we didn't take just a moment to recognize for greetings and comments our own beloved Hazel tenBroek."

As Mrs. tenBroek came to the microphone, there was a tremendous ovation. She spoke as follows: "Thank you. If I can stop crying, I'm so happy. Certainly, if anyone deserved that award, Sharon did. I'm sure that for the next ten years she will work as hard as she ever has.

"This has been a wonderful convention. I don't know how anyone could deny that. I think back to 1940 and the fourteen people—there were two representatives from seven states meeting along with the state Federation in Pennsylvania—when this organization was formed. Our main



concern at that time was to get enough aid and some rehab money for all the blind people in the country. At the Resolutions Committee the other day I looked around at the group at the table and around those in the audience and thought, 'well, we certainly have grown up.' I looked at people who were educated and well dressed and who were working, and one of their main concerns

was to bring along those who had no jobs and still had to get their educations. One of the fun things was that in 1940 we were worried about getting aid. But the other day we were doing more than that. One of the resolutions that was presented to the Committee was wondering about whether or not some of the financial sheets could be put in Braille. I think we've come a long way."

## BLIND OF DALLAS ACHIEVE BIG SUCCESS

### GOVERNOR AND MAYOR ISSUE PROCLAMATIONS

For the past several years the Progressive [Dallas] Chapter has held a banquet during White Cane Week—May 15 - 21. However, this is no ordinary banquet. It serves as a springboard for general public awareness throughout the community. It attracts hundreds of people, stimulates widespread media coverage, and results in proclamations from mayors and governors. This year it was bigger and better than ever before. Because of delays in correspondence, the activity surrounding the National Convention, and the general slippage which sometimes occurs in communications, the event was not mentioned in the Presidential Report at the National Convention; so we now bring it to Monitor readers, complete with description and Proclamations.

Chapter President Ronald J. Byrd wrote to President Jernigan early in June as follows: "The members of the National Federation of the Blind and the citizens of Dallas are still talking about the success of our White Cane Banquet, which

was held May 21, 1983. We had 210 persons to attend. The Mayor of Dallas and the Governor of Texas issued Proclamations for the occasion. The Progressive Chapter received more press coverage than ever before including two thirty-minute television interviews, two thirty-minute radio interviews, and an article in the local newspaper. We were pleased to have NFB Secretary Rami Rabby as the keynote speaker."

President Byrd's description gives the overall picture, but it cannot capture the full spirit and pageantry of the occasion: Nor can it detail the planning and hours of work which were required to make the meeting the success it was. This is a good example of what Federation members and Chapters can do to increase awareness and build the movement. Here are the Proclamations from the Mayor of Dallas and the Governor of Texas:

---

## OFFICE OF THE MAYOR/CITY OF DALLAS

## MARK WHITE, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

## PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the determination and tenacity of the blind in overcoming their inconvenience and living a productive and normal life is proved daily by countless blind persons, and

Whereas, the white cane in symbol and fact is of tremendous help to the blind person in his/her travels and productive work, and

Whereas, public awareness and appreciation of the white cane and its meaning can contribute even more to the ability of the blind person to walk through doors of opportunities and accomplishments, and

Whereas, the National Federation of the Blind, Progressive Chapter, Dallas, Texas, carries on a continuous program to inform the public about the meaning and symbolism of the white cane, and

Whereas, all of us should become increasingly aware of the significance of the white cane and exercise the fullest courtesy and caution in every encounter with its bearers,

Now, therefore, I, A. Starke Taylor, Jr., Mayor of the City of Dallas, do hereby proclaim the week of Sunday, May 15 through Saturday, May 21, 1983

## WHITE CANE WEEK

In observance of this occasion which is sponsored by the National Federation of the Blind.

A. Starke Taylor, Jr.  
Mayor, The City of Dallas

## GREETINGS:

AUSTIN, TEXAS

Since 1940, the National Federation of the Blind has worked to integrate blind persons into American Society so they are seen as normal and productive citizens.

The blind are speaking for themselves with an effective voice through the National Federation of the Blind.

Blind persons, if provided quality services and if given equal opportunity become loyal, productive employees who make viable contributions to any employer.

The National Federation of the Blind has provided public information and technical assistance to schools, local, state, and federal officials to change myths and misconceptions about blindness.

The National Federation of the Blind has assisted many blind persons in securing gainful employment throughout the State of Texas which benefits all concerned.

The National Federation of the Blind, due to its positive influence and contributions, deserves public recognition and support for its policy of equality, opportunity and security for all blind persons in the State of Texas.

Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the month of May, 1983, as

## FEDERATION OF THE BLIND MONTH

in Texas, and urge all citizens and employers in the State to support the aims, goals and work of the National Federation of the Blind.

In official recognition whereof, I hereby affix my signature this 26th day of April, 1983

Mark White  
Governor of Texas

## AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND TRIES IT STATE BY STATE

### NEW TACTICS—SAME OLD OBJECTIVE

Year after year we have pointed out that the American Foundation for the Blind (which has much money, no membership, and no valid claim to national status except for its hired representatives throughout the various regions of the country) is attempting to gain complete control over the lives of blind people and the agencies established to give them service. We repeatedly assert it and present the evidence, and the Foundation just as repeatedly denies it. We say that the Foundation seeks nothing less than absolute and total domination of each and every aspect of anything dealing with the blind—total monopoly. The Foundation says that it is simply our warped imagination and negative thinking.

Recent events in Virginia helped bring the matter into focus. Look for the same sort of tactics in your state. The Foundation now seeks to coordinate all legislative and social action projects, not just nationally but state by state.

Charles Brown is the President of the National Federation of the Blind of Virginia. He is a courteous and a soft spoken man, but he knows presumption when he meets it; and he knows how to speak with directness when the situation calls for it. Not long ago he received a letter from Patricia Beattie, who

pretentiously describes herself as the Community Consultant for the American Foundation for the Blind for an entire region of the United States. Ms. Beattie's letter and Mr. Brown's make instructive reading:

---

Washington, D.C.  
July 18, 1983

Dear Mr. Brown:

I'm writing to invite you to participate in a meeting to discuss concerns of visually-handicapped Virginians.

The meeting will be held at 3:00 p.m., Friday, August 5, 1983 at the Downtowner Motor Inn, corner of Seventh and Marshall, Richmond.

As the Community Consultant for the American Foundation for the Blind in this region, I've been contacted by many professionals and consumers of services for the visually-handicapped who are interested in working with other Virginians who share similar concerns about several changes included in the proposed 1984-85 state budget.

As you probably are aware, Governor Robb's administration is proposing some alarming cuts in funds and also some

program realignments that would greatly affect the delivery of library and social services to blind and visually-impaired citizens.

One proposal would cut out the entire \$300,000 in state funds from the sheltered workshops. Another would eliminate seven positions which provide Title XX social services. There also is question of the proposed transfer of library services out of the jurisdiction of the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped (VDVH).

A representative of VDVH has been invited to attend and provide detailed information about the budget proposals and an update on negotiations with the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Please feel free to share with the group any other concerns which you may have. I am convening this meeting as a forum for discussion and planning for cooperative action whenever the group decides would be appropriate.

Other topics on the agenda will include the proposed Virginia Rehabilitation Act and national concerns such as the long-standing vacancy in the Division of Blind and Visually Impaired in the United States Department of Education.

If you have any questions or would like more information, please don't hesitate to telephone me at (202) 429-0358.

I look forward to seeing you August 5th at the meeting.

Sincerely,  
Patricia M. Beattie  
Community Consultant

---

#### TENTATIVE AGENDA

##### Concerns of Visually-Handicapped Virginians

Friday, August 5, 1983, 3:00 p.m.

Downtown Motor Inn  
Corner 7th and Marshall  
Richmond, VA  
(804) 649-0316

Convening of the Forum and Introductions: Patricia M. Beattie, Community Consultant, American Foundation for the Blind

Summary of 1984-85 State Budget: George A. Koger, Executive Assistant to the Commissioner, Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped

National Issues: Alan M. Dinsmore, Legislative Network Coordinator, American Foundation for the Blind

Proposed Virginia Rehabilitation Act: Thomas C. Michael, Chair, Rehabilitation Committee, Governor's Overall Advisory Committee on Needs of Handicapped Persons

Other Concerns and Discussion: All Participants

Development of Action Plan

Set Next Meeting

Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

---

Arlington, Virginia  
August 3, 1983

Dear Ms. Beattie:

---

I have received your letter inviting me to attend your upcoming meeting in Richmond to discuss the proposed budget of the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped and other "concerns of visually handicapped Virginians." Frankly, I find your invitation to be more than a little presumptuous.

For twenty-five years, the National Federation of the Blind of Virginia has been working to improve the lives of blind people in this Commonwealth. We have successfully secured enactment of the Model White Cane Law, legislation to prohibit insurance discrimination, and other vital civil rights legislation. We have also worked to bring about improvements in services to the blind from the Department for the Visually Handicapped. We are well organized statewide through our seven active local chapters. We have long-established state committees on legislation and DVH liaison that are already dealing with the issues raised in your letter, and many other issues as well.

While we were working effectively for the blind, what was the American Foundation for the Blind up to? Your agency has been using its vast financial resources to engage in a relentless and vicious attack on us—the organized blind movement. Is it any wonder that the blind do not trust the Foundation?

Now you propose to swoop down on Richmond to lead a two-hour meeting dealing

with "our" concerns. Through the Federation, we the blind have learned to speak for ourselves. We do not permit the DVH to speak for us, or anyone else for that matter. We the blind have our own elected representatives. As Federationists, we are certainly not about to allow you—a hired bureaucrat representing a New York charitable agency—to become a self-appointed spokesperson for us.

While I have asked certain Federationists to attend and observe your meeting, you may be assured that we will continue to run our own affairs through democratic self-organization, without the alleged benefits of your leadership.

If you really want to be effective in improving the lives of blind people, I challenge you to come and join with us. I invite you to attend one of our meetings. Since I understand that you live in Northern Virginia, I would urge you to attend a meeting of our Potomac Chapter. We meet at 8:00 p.m. on the second Wednesday of each month at the Central United Methodist Church on Fairfax Drive (across from the Ballston Metro Station) in Arlington. We invite you to join us on the barricades in our struggle for first-class citizenship.

Sincerely,  
Charles S. Brown, President  
National Federation of the Blind of  
Virginia



## RECIPES

## ICEBOX ORANGE COOKIES

by Andrea Moore

*(Andrea Moore is an active Federationist from Texas. She is undergoing the rigors of law school, but she always finds time to come to Marches on Washington, Annual Conventions, Congressional testifyings, and other such events.)*

**Directions:** Crumble up (with a hammer, blender, or rolling pin) one small box of vanilla wafers and place in large mixing bowl. Add one small box powdered sugar; stir till lumps of powdered sugar have been stirred well. Add one six ounce can of frozen orange juice and about a teaspoon of vanilla. Stir well. Chop up one and a half cups desired nuts. Grease hands with margarine or cooking oil. Roll mixture into balls about the size of a walnut and roll balls in nuts. (It is less messy if one person rolls mixture and the other rolls balls into nuts; otherwise, if you do all the balls at once before rolling them in the nuts, the balls tend to dry out and will not allow themselves to be coated.) Store in icebox or freezer; the older they are, the better they are. Lemonade can be substituted for orange juice and coconut for nuts.

## ENGLISH MUFFINS

*“Thomas’s promises, but Lucy guarantees.”*

by Lucy Carpenter

*(Lucy Carpenter is the President of the Eastern Orange County Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind of New York.)*

**Ingredients:** 5 cups flour  
2 envelopes yeast  
¼ cup sugar  
1 tablespoon salt  
2 cups hot tap water, to start

**Directions:** Mix dry ingredients. Add water to right consistency. Knead for a few minutes till smooth. Grease enough cookie sheets to hold about two dozen muffins. Pull off a ball of dough from dough, about three inches in diameter. Roll nicely round and place on cookie sheet. Flatten until one quarter inch thick. Cover and allow to rise for forty-five minutes. Bake in 425 degree oven for fifteen minutes. Bake first seven minutes then turn over for the rest of the time. Yields about two dozen. This is a terrific fundraiser at bake sales. We sell them for \$3.00 per dozen.

### FRIED APPLE PIES

by Barbara Cheadle

*(Note: As Monitor readers know, Barbara Cheadle is the Editor of Future Reflections, our magazine for parents and educators of blind children. She formerly worked at the Nebraska agency, then lived in Missouri, and now resides in Boise, Idaho, where husband John is employed as Deputy Director of the Idaho Commission for the Blind. From the following recipe it is also clear that she knows how to cook.)*

**Dough:** 2 cups flour  
1 teaspoon salt  
1/3 cup shortening

**Directions:** Mix and add ice water as needed for right consistency.

Roll out dough to 1/8" thickness and cut into 5" circles (or pinch off enough dough and roll each circle out separately).

Add filling to half of dough circle, keeping it ½" from edge. Brush edge of pastry with water, fold over, and press edge with fork to seal. Prick top half of pie with fork.

Heat 3 cups of shortening (360 degress), fry pie on each side about two to three minutes, or until golden brown.

#### MONITOR MINIATURES ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

##### ◇Talk-Net:

Bob Branco writes: "We have been working with Talk-Net, an affiliate of the NBC Radio Network, to have our public service announcements aired. Maurice Tunick, the producer, admits that our spots are of excellent quality. However, he has decided to put us on a waiting list, since other organizations are also trying to get their spots on the air. To insure that Mr. Tunick will keep us in mind and perhaps take us off the waiting list and air our spots, please send a letter of encouragement to Maurice Tunick, Producer, Talk-Net, NBC Radio, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York 10020. For further details, contact Bob Branco, 359 Coggeshall Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts 02746; 617-994-4972."

◇From the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS/BPH):

The first voice-indexed dictionary for blind and physically handicapped people has been produced by the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS/BPH) of the Library of Congress. Recorded from the

Concise Heritage Dictionary published by Houghton Mifflin Company, the cassette dictionary contains all of the 55,000 entries of the print edition.

The dictionary is contained on 219 sides of 55 cassettes and is recorded in the standard NLS/BPH 4-track, 15/16 inches-per-second format. An additional cassette contains detailed instructions on the use of the voice-indexing system and an index to the contents of the 219 sides. The dictionary is housed in five binders holding up to twelve cassettes each and uses only six inches of shelf space.

NLS has entered into an agreement with the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, Kentucky, to duplicate, package, and sell the dictionary at cost. It should be available for purchase by blind and physically handicapped individuals by late fall 1983 at the production cost of \$82.54 (Catalog #C-1080). The dictionary will also be available for use at each of the 160 cooperating libraries nationwide serving NLS/BPH readers.

◇From Hal Bleakley:

"Aids Unlimited, Inc. has added 90

minute and 60 minute cassettes to our rapidly expanding product line.

"The 90 minute cassettes are: one—\$1.35 each; three—\$1.25 each; five—\$1.20 each; ten—\$1.10 each. The 60 minute cassettes are: one—\$1.15 each; three—\$1.10 each; five—\$1.05 each; ten—\$.95 each.

"These are voice grade cassettes. Also, we now have a cassette catalog available at \$1.35 each. To order, send check or money order to: Aids Unlimited, Inc., 1101 North Calvert Street, Suite 1901, Baltimore, Maryland 21202; (301) 659-0232."

◇Steve Machalow appointed:

Under date of June 21, 1983, President Jernigan received a letter from Dr. William Graves, Director of the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Blindness and Low Vision, Mississippi State, Mississippi. The letter states:

"I am delighted to be able to inform you that Dr. Steven Machalow will be joining the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Blindness and Low Vision as its Research Director in September, 1983. Until September, Dr. Machalow will be completing current projects at the Division of Innovation and Development, Special Needs Section, Office of Special Education, U.S. Department of Education. At the Division of Innovation and Development, Dr. Machalow's responsibilities included designing and monitoring support for Deaf-Blind programs, providing technical assistance to special education programs, and representing the U.S. Office of Special Education in intra-departmental task forces.

"Dr. Machalow received his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota in Anthro-

pology. In his dissertation, he examined the changing images of blind Americans. He has also conducted opinion surveys and analyzed data for the National Opinion Research Center.

"Dr. Machalow comes to the Center highly recommended by his colleagues at the Department of Education, National Science Foundation, and National Institute for Handicapped Research. He was well-received by the staff of the RRTC during his interview process.

"I hope you will join me and welcome Dr. Machalow to the Center. He and his wife and two children—one four years old and when he arrives one six weeks old—will be a real asset to the Center, the University, and the community. I know you will want to visit with him at our next Advisory Council meeting."

◇Youngstown:

Tom Anderson of Youngstown, Ohio, sends us an article from the May 29, 1983, Warren Tribune

"Being blind can be little more than a nuisance if the individual can handle it, the National Federation of the Blind believes.

"And it is working toward making life better for blind citizens.

"The president of the Ohio unit of the group, the Rev. Robert Eschbach, was in the Mahoning Valley Monday to spread the message that being blind doesn't mean being hopeless or helpless.

"The National Federation of the Blind of Mahoning Valley Inc. held its annual banquet Monday night. Eschbach was in town to attend the banquet and to assess the progress of a new chapter being established by April Reisinger, 1414 Clemmens Ave., N.W., in Warren.

"In addition to his duties as head of

the Ohio unit of the National Federation of the Blind, Eschbach also is minister at a United Methodist Church in Columbus."

#### ◇Blind Priest:

From the Youngstown, Ohio, Victicator June 1, 1983:

Akron (AP)—Pata Nicolino, who is about to be ordained as a Roman Catholic priest, sometimes worries that people will be too kind to him.

Nicolino, 25, who has been totally blind since he was 19, says his handicap sometimes puts him in a precarious situation with people.

"It's good to allow them to help me—it makes them feel they are contributing something. But it does tend to constrict me. I have to learn to balance the receiving and the giving."

After a special dispensation from the Vatican, Nicolino, an Akron native, will be ordained June 11 in the Cleveland diocese.

He will be the first blind man ordained in the diocese. Officials at the National Conference of Catholics headquarters said Nicolino and the Rev. George Guilfoyle, who was ordained in Camden, N.J., this past week, may be the first totally blind men to enter the priesthood in the United States.

#### ◇CEIP Announcement:

Frequently the Federation receives correspondence from other countries requesting our literature or seeking information on a wide range of blindness-related topics. From time to time foreign visitors tour our National Center. To assist in these and other Federation activities, the Cultural Exchange and International Program (CEIP) Committee

is compiling a list of Federationists with a native language other than English or who are fluent in a foreign language. To be included in the listing or for more information, contact Kathleen Sullivan, 1404 Ferry Street, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601; (608) 784-2343.,

#### ◇Elected:

Sharon Luka writes: The Douglas County Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind of Kansas would like to announce that on Monday, May 16, 1983, we held our annual election of officers. Those elected were: Chuck Hallenbeck, President; Tom Anderson, First Vice President; Lorren Buntmeyer, Second Vice President; Sharon Luka, Secretary; and Pat Steinbacher, Treasurer.

#### ◇From Kathleen McRae of South Dakota:

Recently the Sioux Valley Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind of South Dakota elected the following officers: Betty Minier, President; Kathleen McRae, Vice President; Jeanette Stodtfeld, Secretary; and Carol Moon, Treasurer.

#### ◇From Raymond Rokita, 510 South Jackson Street, Apt. B-2, Jackson, Michigan 49203:

"I am writing to inform you that the notice regarding audio movie soundtracks on cassette which I asked to have printed in the August-September, 1983, Monitor must be canceled. Circumstances have changed, and I cannot carry through on this project."

#### ◇Growth:

Under date of June 28, 1983, Lucy Carpenter, President of the Eastern Orange County Chapter in Newburgh, New



York, writes:

"At our organizational meeting in June of 1981, there were seven people present. This past week we held our election of officers and it is with much pride that I announce that we have a membership of twenty-seven. We are growing. We are making ourselves evident in our community. Our local legislators are aware of us and both our state Assemblyman and our state Senator are NFB Associates.

"Presiding over our elections was our state president, David Stayer: President: Lucy Carpenter; First Vice President: Dick Carpenter; Second Vice President: Ada Fletcher; Secretary: Noe Villeda; Treasurer: Mary Ellen Bowman; and Board Members: Boyd Wolfe and Catherine Brewster.

"I wish to include a special point of interest. Our Secretary, Noe Villeda, is fifteen years old. I am quite certain that he is the youngest officer in our national organization. He is active and bright. He will go far in our movement. Yes, we believe in starting them young at Eastern Orange."

◇From Nevada:

Mrs. Harriet Childers writes: "Charles Childers passed on the 26th of March. He was laid to rest in Reno, Nevada. I would greatly appreciate it if you would put a notice in the Braille Monitor so all his friends of the past would know. He thought quite a bit of Mr. Jernigan. He suffered a lot, and is now at peace."

◇Legislative Effort:

Under date of June 20, 1983, Regina Kreamer writes:

June 6 and 7, 1983, are two memorable

days in the life of the National Federation of the Blind of Pennsylvania. Our affiliate held our first legislative effort in Harrisburg.

Our efforts began many months before with preparation and coordination and some very helpful hints from our National Office. Our President, Patrick Comorato, and our newest member (of only two weeks) Miss Kimberly Gardner, called each and every state senator and House representative in Pennsylvania (253 total) to set up appointments for us while we were in the Capitol.

Our coordinating team arrived in Harrisburg on Sunday evening. We went right to work setting up teams, making last minute changes, and the million and one little things that go into a successful legislative effort.

Monday it was on to the Capitol, one hundred and fifty members strong. We kept 83 appointments on Monday and 121 on Tuesday.

Our first piece of legislation covered the "Mini Randolph-Sheppard Act." This legislation consists of a vending bill which would insure blind vendors priority employment rights on state property. Our second piece of legislation is our state medical assistance bill. Our third request was for oversight hearings on Blindness and Visual Services. (Blindness and Visual Services is the state agency mandated to provide services to blind Pennsylvanians.)

◇Blinded Veterans:

We have received the following announcement from the Blinded Veterans Association:

Thomas H. Miller, a 41-year-old Vietnam veteran and Chief of the Blind Rehabilitation Clinic at the VA Medical

Center in Waco, Texas, was elected as National President and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Blinded Veterans Association (BVA) at its 38th National Convention recently held in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Mr. Miller was unopposed. A native of Detroit, Michigan, Mr. Miller took up residence in Waco when he was appointed Chief of the Blind Rehab Clinic in 1979. Mr. Miller, who lettered in football, basketball, and baseball in high school, is a graduate of the University of Detroit where he earned a B.S. Degree in Biology in 1965. Upon graduation, Mr. Miller enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. He was blinded in a land mine explosion in Vietnam.

#### ◇Proclamation:

Our Pueblo, Colorado, Chapter is becoming increasingly active and effective. An article in the May 18, 1983, Pueblo Chieftain and Star-Journal is headlined: "Blind Attend Declaration of Week of White Cane." The article says in part:

"With an icy wind at their backs and white canes tapping the pavement beneath them, half a dozen blind people walked to City Hall on Tuesday to make a point.

"Their five-block journey through Downtown Pueblo ended with City Council President Mel Takaki signing a proclamation in their behalf.

"In part it read: 'A white cane, which every blind citizen of our state has the right to carry, symbolizes the ability to achieve a full and independent life, and the capacity to work productively in competitive employment.'

"Moments later, Takaki declared this as 'White Cane Week' in the city.

"Alyce Bouy, president of the National

Federation of the Blind of Pueblo, thanked Takaki on behalf of all the people who made the walk."

#### ◇Good Housekeeping

The October, 1983, issue of Good Housekeeping magazine contains an article in the Better Way section entitled "Mutual Help." The National Federation of the Blind is listed as the organization to contact for information and help about blindness.

#### ◇Material in Spanish:

The speech "Blindness: Handicap or Characteristic" by President Jernigan is now available on a C-60 cassette in Spanish. The recording was done at the National Office in Baltimore, July 25, 1983. The translation and reading are done by David Arocho, who is a member of our New York affiliate. There is a brief opening message (both in Spanish and English) by President Jernigan. Copies of the cassette will be sent to regional libraries and to anyone who requests them as long as the supply lasts. We will attempt to make enough copies to meet all anticipated demand. If the demand and interest warrant, we will translate additional material into Spanish. In any case, we would be pleased to have reaction.

#### ◇Tuesday's Child:

Stan and Karin Cox of Portland, Oregon, proudly announce the arrival of their new baby girl, Lauri Michelle. Lauri came into the world Tuesday morning, June 14, 1983, at 2:35 A.M. She weighed in at nine pounds, ten ounces, and measured nineteen inches long. Stan and Karin are members of the Greater Portland Chapter. It should also be

noted that Karin is our representative on the State Commission for the Blind Board. It is reported that mother, father, and baby are all doing quite well.

#### ◇NASA Library Services:

The Lewis Research Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is beginning a project to make their extensive library of scientific and technical information available to blind users. They want to hear from interested blind persons in Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota who believe they would like to use the library. They want to know whether Braille or recorded formats are preferred. For more information contact: Mr. Joseph A. Nervi, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio 44135.

#### ◇Wants American Pen Pals:

Mr. Tomoshige Furuya of Kawasaki City, Japan, is interested in corresponding in Grade One Braille with Americans of all backgrounds. You may write to him at 1146 Mizonokichi, Takatsu-ku, Kawasaki City, Japan, 213.

#### ◇New Chapter:

Peggy Pinder, President of the National Federation of the Blind of Iowa and member of the National Board, writes:

"We organized the Ottumwa Chapter, named the South Central Iowa Chapter, on July 23, 1983. Sixteen people from the area were joined by more than twenty persons from elsewhere in Iowa for a picnic followed by the organizing meeting. Local publicity included a newspaper article before the event and a

live radio broadcast, done by Dick Davis and me, half an hour prior to the picnic. The following people were elected: Tim Terrell, President; Annabelle Stone, Vice President; Regina Ferrington, Secretary; Louise Mauer, Treasurer; and Jim Kanney, Board Member.

#### ◇New Magazine:

Steve Handschu has requested that we print the following announcement:

'Freedom Ideas International (FII) is a review of the minority and radical press throughout the world. FII is published four times a year on 4-track cassettes by the Our Right to Know Braille Press, Inc., a new organization created and controlled by blind people. We believe that we, blind and print-handicapped people, need to read for ourselves the thoughts of people around the world who are oppressed and are fighting for change, if we are ever to achieve our own emancipation.

"The articles in FII are chosen from many publications and countries. They are concerned with freedom struggles currently taking place. They reflect a wide variety of ideas and experiences. If you have wanted to read the latest from and about working people, people of color, women, gay people, and young people, FII is what you have been looking for.

"To request a sample copy, or to subscribe, write to: The Our Right to Know Braille Press, Inc., 640 Bayside, Detroit, Michigan 48217. The subscription cost to borrow the tapes is \$5.00 per year. To purchase and keep the tapes the cost is \$10.00 per year. Make check or money order payable to: The Our Right to Know Braille Press, Inc."

#### ◇For Sale:

We have received the following announcement from Brenda Galloway of Louisiana:

"Optacon, Model RD1 plus carrying case and all manuals. Purchased new from Telesensory Systems January, 1982. Used only slightly. Owner never took training and desires to sell. Absolutely perfect condition with no damages. Price: \$3,500 cash or \$2,000 cash and \$100 per month for 18 months. Contact Brenda Galloway (504) 643-6780. Collect calls accepted. If not home, leave message with phone recorder."

#### ◇Recognized for Merit:

Fred Schroeder, President of the National Federation of the Blind of New Mexico, has just concluded a term as a member of the Professional Standards Committee for the Council for Exceptional Children. He has now been appointed for an additional term and has received the following certificate of recognition:

"The Council for Exceptional Children recognizes with great appreciation the contributions of Frederic Schroeder during service as Member, Professional Standards Committee, for a term ending June 30, 1983. Lyndall Bullock, President, Council for Exceptional Children."

#### ◇From the Michigan Focus

"Karen Mullin of our Lansing Chapter recently received 'The Grand Eagle Award' from the Bell Telephone Company for her outstanding achievements in job performance. She was one of seven persons presented with this award throughout the nationwide Bell Telephone companies. Karen has received many commendations from staff and customers, and on

October 22, 1982, Karen was selected as one of three of the seven honored employees to be presented in a film to be shown throughout this region. Karen has been employed as an operator with Michigan Bell for four and one-half years. Traditionally, this award has been presented to administrative and upper level management. We feel that this has been a great honor bestowed upon Karen, and this has been because of Karen's personal achievements in her work. The National Federation of the Blind of Michigan congratulates you Karen." So do all of the rest of us in the Federation.

#### ◇Braille Transcriber:

Mrs. Rebecca Schrenell, 75 Brooklake Road—#25A, Florham Park, New Jersey 07932, writes as follows:

"Rebecca Schrenell, Certified Transcriber for Hire. Turn-around for average material would probably be three weeks. Straight Braille at \$5.00 a page. I also represent a company that does Braille Tactile Signage. Any signs done in print can be done in Braille. I am excited about this new business venture and hope I can be of service to your members."

◇From Eileen O'Brien, 791 Cambridge, Elmhurst, Illinois 60126:

"Any kidney transplant having a clinic appointment at the University of Minnesota in November, December, or January, please contact me. The transplant office has okayed our all going the same day if we let them know two months in advance. Let's make it NFB day at the transplant office."

◇New Portable Tape Recorder and Player:



Recently we received the following letter and announcement from Mr. William Prenovitz, Program Supervisor, Massachusetts Association for the Blind, 200 Ivy Street, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146; (617) 738-5110:

"Enclosed please find information about our newest product that will be available in September, 1983. The product, the BIT TALKMAN, will be a Walkman-like stereo cassette recorder that will also play Library of Congress tapes. Because of the great interest expressed by blind people for such a machine, we expect the response to this product to be very positive. And we look forward to helping people benefit from this most recent technology. Therefore, we would appreciate your assistance in helping us to notify blind people across the country about this exciting new product..."

"BIT TALKMAN—A high fidelity, personal-sized stereo cassette recorder that plays Library of Congress format tapes (half speed, four track). Talkman plays and records stereo, but only plays the Library of Congress format. Plays FM stereo radio. Variable speed. Tone indexing. Battery operated. (Batteries not included, 3 5/16" x 5 1/2" x 1 5/16" \$195.00) Talkman comes with: headphones, belt clip and shoulder strap, stereo microphone, cassette instructions, 1 year warranty. Optional accessories available: AC adapter, NI-CAD batteries, portable speakers."

◇From Steve Machalow:

Trish Miller and Steve Machalow are proud to announce the birth of their son Jacobus Shalom Dale Machalow. He was born on July 29 at 1:37 a.m. He weighed seven pounds, ten ounces, and was twenty

inches long. Jacobus, big sister Rebecca, Trish, and Steve are looking forward to seeing you all at national convention next year.

◇Caribbean Cruise:

Philip Oliver, President of the National Federation of the Blind of Massachusetts, requests that we place the following announcement in the Monitor:

"The National Federation of the Blind of Massachusetts, in cooperation with Roux Travel Service of Fitchburg, Massachusetts, is in the process of arranging a two-week Caribbean cruise. This two-week luxury vacation is planned for late fall of 1984. In order to get our choice of cabins we must book early. More details will be forthcoming in future Monitors. If you are seriously interested in this type of vacation, contact Mr. Philip Oliver, 109 Nelson Street, Leominster, Massachusetts 01453, or call (617) 537-3099."

◇National Braille Press:

We have been asked to place the following announcement in the Monitor:

"Advances in technology have made Braille use and production a dynamic subject. Braille Research Newsletter contains articles covering a variety of subjects such as tactile diagrams, telebraille, Braille to print systems, etc. Braille or print copies are available from the National Braille Press, Inc., 88 St. Stephen Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02115 for \$6.00 each. Please specify print or Braille."

◇Quran Available:

The Kazi Publications, 1215 West Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60657, has asked us to place the following



announcement in the Monitor

"Please let it be known to your members that we have received a limited supply of the Holy Quran translated by Yousuf Ali in Braille in English (18 volumes). We also have two Holy Qurans in Braille in Urdu language, one by Mahmudul-Hasan (8 volumes). We also have Holy Quran in Arabic only in 6 volumes. The prices are as follows: Yousuf Ali: \$495.00, PPD anywhere; Urdu: \$249.00, PPD anywhere, and Arabic only: \$199.00, PPD anywhere. These are available on a first come first served basis. If out of stock, these can be ordered by mail 50 percent in advance and 50 percent on delivery, which will be anywhere from three to six months depending on supply."

◇Pickets Board of Education:

On Thursday and Friday, July 28 - 29, 1983, NAC accreditation of the Missouri School for the Blind was reported to be a topic for consideration by the Missouri State Board of Education, which has jurisdiction over the School; but events did not go that way. The members of the Missouri affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind (led by President Billie Weaver) showed up in force. While some stayed outside to picket, others went inside to present their case. The matter did not come up for formal consideration. There was too much heat. However, there was a great deal of discussion and behind-the-scenes negotiating. There was also a great deal of press and radio and television coverage. At the time of this writing the decision still hangs in the balances, but one thing is certain. Regardless of the outcome, NAC has taken a heavy blow in Missouri.

◇That's How it is in Georgia:

Monitor readers are familiar with the name of David Shapiro. He is a shop worker, who lives in Griffin, Georgia. Several months ago he made inquiries as to whether the policy board for the Department of Human Resources (the department which operates most programs for the blind) had ever had a handicapped member. He received his answer in a letter dated January 28, 1983, from Dr. James G. Ledbetter, the head of the department. The last portion of Dr. Ledbetter's letter is worth quoting and requires no comment. Here it is: "In regard to DHR Board composition, to my knowledge we have never had a member of the Board who was physically handicapped. We do have several councils and advisory groups with numerous physically handicapped members. Board members are appointed by the Governor; one from each Congressional District and five members at large. Five members must be physicians. I hope this information will be helpful to you."

◇Million Dollar Purchase:

The American Foundation for the Blind is fond of telling us that the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped (NAC) is absolutely independent and that NAC is, in no way, owned by the Foundation. Of course, the American Foundation for the Blind has always provided at least half of the NAC budget and has repeatedly given it other assistance, such as personnel and the like. Now we arrive at a new dimension. At the fall, 1982, meeting of NAC the Foundation announced that it was putting a million dollars into an endowment fund for NAC. It also said that it would use its

staff, as well as its contacts and other resources, to help NAC raise another two million dollars to match the first one. Truth crushed to hearth shall rise again.

◇Two Federationists Die:

The Minnesota Bulletin for May-June, 1983, announces the deaths of two longtime, dedicated Federationists—Jim Schleppegrell and Larry Elias. Jim was President of the NFB of Minnesota from 1967 to 1971. Those who attended the national convention in Minneapolis in 1970 will remember his genial welcome and warm hospitality. He guided the affiliate through troubled times and gave the best that he had. He died of cancer April 28, 1983. Likewise, Larry Elias was a veteran in the movement. He was staunch and loyal, and he never wavered. He was one of those people who help make up the backbone of an organization, its quiet core of strength. He died March 27, 1983.

◇Baby:

Johnny Ott reports that August 16, 1983, Mark Andrew Ott came into the world in Detroit. Mark's parents are Mike and Barb Ott, brother and sister-in-law of Johnny.

◇Braille Selectric:

In the March, 1983, Monitor we announced that Dialogue Magazine had re-

ported that Camwill, Inc., had produced an element which would make it possible for any IBM Selectric typewriter to produce Braille. Since that time we have been told that Camwill is no longer located at the address given. We are told that their current address is: 875 Wamanu, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5280. B. T. Kimbrough reports in the Summer, 1983, Dialogue that the Braille produced by the Camwill product is smaller than standard and that typists must follow special procedures to produce it. Those interested in learning more about this product should contact Camwill to request a sample of the Braille produced and instructions for the use of the device.

◇Dies:

On August 28, 1983, at the Deaconess Hospital in Boston Sally Prentice (one of the leaders of our Connecticut affiliate) died. The loss to the Federation is immeasurable. Those who attended this year's Convention will remember that a letter from Sally was quoted in the banquet address. She had spirit and courage and good common sense. She also had love and generosity. Sally was a member of the Board of Directors of the National Federation of the Blind of Connecticut, a member of the Danbury Chapter, and a devoted member of the movement.

**RESOLUTIONS**  
**NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND CONVENTION**  
**KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI, 1983**

At the 1983 Convention of the National Federation of the Blind held in Kansas City, Missouri, during the first week of July, twenty-seven resolutions (83-01 through 83-27) were sent to the floor by the Resolutions Committee. Two resolutions (83-101 and 83-102) were sent to the floor by the Board of Directors. 83-23 (which deplored the advertisement by National Industries for the Blind that appeared in the June 27, 1983, issue of Time Magazine) was withdrawn because it was found (during floor debate) to have technical flaws. 83-25 (which called upon Congress to change the currency by causing bills of different size to be issued so that blind persons could identify paper money without assistance) was defeated after floor debate. Although the majority opposed Resolution 83-25, there was considerable sentiment in favor of it. It seems likely that it will be introduced again in future years. 83-01 through 83-22, 83-24 through 83-27, 83-102, and 83-101 (with attachments) are herewith reprinted. Because of its withdrawal, 83-23 is omitted.

**NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND**  
**RESOLUTION 83-01**

**Whereas**, the Division for the Blind and Visually Impaired was established to assist the Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) in administering federal support for rehabilitation and related services to the blind; and

**Whereas**, a "Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegation of Authority" was published in the Federal Register in 1971 and prescribed the duties of the then "Office of the Blind" (now the Division for the Blind and Visually Impaired) to include "Leadership for achievement of agency missions...leadership and consultation to regional offices, state agencies, and other grantees in the development and expansion of rehabilitation programs and services for blind and visually handicapped, maintained liaison with national organizations of and for the blind, and with the blind community nationwide to serve as a focal point and to provide increased leadership and advocacy for the nation's blind and visually handicapped;" and

**Whereas**, a reorganization of the Rehabilitation Services Administration is proposed in which the Division for the Blind and Visually Impaired will cease to exist and its functions will be transferred to an umbrella unit responsible for programs for persons with various disabling conditions; and

**Whereas**, a majority of the states provide services to the blind through state agencies or administrative units which are separate from the agencies serving persons with disabilities other than blindness; and

**Whereas**, all states participate in the federal Randolph-Sheppard program, requiring specialized administration from the federal level; and

**Whereas**, it has been shown conclusively that programs for blind and

visually impaired persons are administered most efficiently and with the greatest benefit to the persons they are responsible for serving when these programs are organized in specialized agencies designed to serve the blind rather than a general population of the disabled: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization call upon the Secretary of Education to maintain and strengthen the Division for the Blind and Visually Impaired in the Rehabilitation Services Administration; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that, to achieve a strengthening of the programs under the Division for the Blind as called for in this resolution, we urge the Secretary of Education to reaffirm the "Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegation of Authority" of the Division for the Blind and Visually Impaired and to insure that the Division has capacity, staff, and resources to fulfill its mission.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-02

**Whereas**, blind people, no less than sighted people, should have access to commercial sales and marketing information found in the advertising pages of mass distribution magazines; and

**Whereas**, several of the mass distribution magazines are available to the blind in recorded and Braille form; and

**Whereas**, in most cases, the regular print editions of these magazines carry advertising for commercial sales purposes, yet this information is purpose-

fully excluded from the Braille and recorded editions; and

**Whereas**, the policy of omitting commercial advertising from mass distribution magazines denies blind people access to information concerning essential products and services and constitutes official censorship; and

**Whereas**, Section 3403(a)(4) of Public Law 91-375 prohibits the mailing of Free Matter for the Blind and Handicapped which contains advertising: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization urge the Congress of the United States to amend Public Law 91-375 to permit commercial advertising in Braille and recorded editions of mass distribution magazines; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we call upon the Library of Congress and the United States Postal Service to cooperate with this Federation in order to put an end to the practice of official censorship identified in this resolution.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-03

**Whereas**, President Reagan has established a Working Group on Handicapped Policy under the Cabinet Council on Human Resources; and

**Whereas**, the task of this working group, as expressed by its chairman, is to develop a national policy statement on the "handicapped/disabled" to identify all federal legislation that provides funds for the "handicapped/disabled" to determine the extent of coverage in federal programs for the "handi-



capped/disabled" to identify in each agency legislation that is inconsistent with the national policy on "handicapped/disabled" and to establish a plan of action that will bring about the needed changes in legislation and regulations that make them coincide with the national policy; and

**Whereas**, these objectives have potential for providing a more rational approach in federal and federally assisted programs affecting the blind. However, consultation with the blind, themselves, is a vital step in an undertaking of this magnitude and scope; and

**Whereas**, this organization has repeatedly announced its willingness and stands ready to assist in endeavors of the sort being conducted by the Handicapped Policy Working Group. Yet, to this date, no consultation has been sought by the Administration on such matters; and

**Whereas**, the President's campaign promises of reform in federal programs can only be achieved if he and others in his Administration reach out to the intended beneficiaries of these programs (such as the blind, themselves) rather than relying on advice from administrators of agencies who have vested interest in opposing the needed reform initiatives; and

**Whereas**, the hope that the Reagan presidency could bring forth policy reforms advantageous to blind consumers of federal and federally assisted programs will fade into oblivion if Administration policy makers continue to stand at arm's length in relationship to blind consumers: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in

the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization reaffirm its commitment to aid in constructing meaningful reform proposals in legislation and federal policy to assure that programs paid for with tax dollars better respond to our actual needs rather than suiting the conveniences and aims of the bureaucrats who administer them; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that, to achieve the objectives of this resolution, we call upon the President's Working Group on Handicapped Policy to join with us in discussing and planning toward the development of viable reform proposals.

#### NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND RESOLUTION 83-04

**Whereas**, Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, required federal contractors and subcontractors to take affirmative action in employing and advancing in employment qualified handicapped individuals, including persons who are blind or visually impaired; and

**Whereas**, the law authorizes the Secretary of Labor to investigate complaints and to issue compliance orders requiring covered employers to adhere to the affirmative action mandate; and

**Whereas**, our experience in using Labor's procedures for investigating and processing complaints reveals a consistent approach of failing aggressively to pursue issues of discrimination against qualified blind individuals, no matter how clear-cut the discrimination or how well it may be documented; and

**Whereas**, Labor's preference for emphasizing "voluntary compliance" and "technical assistance" in its enforcement of



Section 503 should properly be the threshold approach, but not become the exclusive compliance procedure exercised effectively by Labor; and

**Whereas**, vigorous enforcement of Section 503 should include the aggressive investigation and timely prosecution of complaints brought by handicapped individuals. However, these objectives seem far removed from the current strategy, under which labor argues, as well, that persons having complaints should be limited to its administrative procedures and not have a private right of action to pursue their claims independently through litigation against federal contractors: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization call upon the Secretary of Labor to initiate a more vigorous, balanced, and equitable enforcement strategy for Section 503, including an improved training program for labor investigators in order to better equip them to identify cases of noncompliance with the affirmative action mandate; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that, in the context of a strengthened commitment to improving the enforcement of Section 503, the Secretary of Labor should reconsider and reverse the decision earlier made to oppose private suits brought in federal court seeking compliance with the affirmative action requirements of Section 503.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-05

**Whereas**, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, bans

discrimination against qualified handicapped individuals by recipients of federal aid; and

**Whereas**, the history of Section 504's implementation (as well as the Congressional mandate and subsequent statements explaining it) supports the view that this statute should be interpreted broadly as a civil rights law and a mandate to recipients of federal funds not to practice discrimination on the basis of handicap; and

**Whereas**, it has come to our attention that policy makers in the Department of Justice are considering a plan to scale back the extent of Section 504's coverage by applying the requirements of nondiscrimination regulations only to those programs and activities for which the federal financial assistance has specifically been awarded; and

**Whereas**, this limitation would thwart the already restricted civil rights protection now available to us under federal law; and

**Whereas**, the benefits derived by recipients of federal assistance are not truly program specific but normally have a more generic effect; and

**Whereas**, the net effect of separating programs by virtue of direct federal financial aid is merely to encourage would-be violators of current requirements to adopt creative accounting purposefully to evade their responsibilities: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization oppose changing the coverage of Section 504's civil rights protection to encompass only those activities for which specific federal

funds are received and spent; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that, consistent with the policies expressed in this resolution, this organization resist any formal efforts to bring about limitations in the scope of protection now available under Section 504.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-06

**Whereas**, the Honorable Barbara Kennelly, United States Representative from Connecticut, sponsored legislation in the 97th Congress to amend Title XXIII, United States Code, for the purpose of authorizing the installation and operation of vending machines in rest, recreation, and safety areas, located on rights-of-way throughout the federal Interstate Highway System; and

**Whereas**, in preparing her legislation for introduction as an amendment to the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, during consideration in the House of Representatives, Mrs. Kennelly consulted with this organization and responded to suggested language furthering the interests of the blind in operation of vending machines and in deriving benefit from revenues generated from such operations; and

**Whereas**, the Kennelly amendment found in Section 111 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, enacted as Public Law 97-424, now holds great potential for expanding services and employment assistance to the blind in virtually every state in our country: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that

this organization express official appreciation to Representative Barbara Kennelly—a friend of the blind and a champion of our progress; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that this organization hereby encourage the agencies of government (state as well as federal) to cooperate and consult with the blind to develop effective plans for swift and successful implementation of the Kennelly amendment.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-07

**Whereas**, at its meeting of May 10, 1983, the Federal Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (ATBCB) began a review of the problems faced by handicapped individuals in commercial air transportation; and

**Whereas**, representatives of the responsible regulatory agencies, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) were present at this meeting to discuss with the Board their regulations on nondiscrimination and access to air transportation; and

**Whereas**, the freedom to travel unimpeded is a fundamental right of all citizens (regardless of visual condition). Yet, enjoyment of this right for the blind, at least, has been obstructed by interpretations and misinterpretations of federal policies, especially when these policies are applied generally to all the handicapped; and

**Whereas**, the responsibility of the federal agencies involved in reviewing commercial air transportation policy affecting the handicapped as a general class is to assure that individuals (such as blind people) who fall within

the definition used to identify the handicapped not be burdened with unrealistic requirements which disregard their true abilities in favor of bureaucratic perceptions of inability: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization urge the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board to assure that commercial air transportation policies of federal agencies respond accurately and appropriately to the realistic abilities and not just the generally perceived disabilities of the handicapped; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that this organization shall remain vigilant to monitor and participate in the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board review of air transportation policy in order to assure that the interests of blind individuals which may be affected by this effort will be protected.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-08

**Whereas**, legislation entitled the "Home Recording Act of 1983" has been introduced in the 98th Congress—specifically, S. 31, sponsored by Senator Charles Mathias of Maryland, and H.R. 1030, sponsored by Representative Don Edwards of California; and

**Whereas**, these bills propose a solution to the problem of copyright infringement which occurs, according to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, whenever a copyrighted audio or visual work is taped for use in the home; and

**Whereas**, these bills propose an exemption from copyright infringement for the home taping of audio or visual materials for use by an individual or the immediate family; and

**Whereas**, the proposed tradeoff for this exemption is a royalty charge to be paid to the holders of copyrights by the manufacturers and importers of home recording devices and media, including standard audio cassette machines and blank cassette tapes; and

**Whereas**, in the event that a royalty charge is placed on such equipment and media, it is virtually inevitable that consumers will ultimately pay the price, if not directly then at least indirectly, in the form of higher prices for the purchase of recording devices and tapes; and

**Whereas**, blind individuals who purchase taping equipment and media depend upon these devices for securing and utilizing essential information not otherwise available to them, hence, possession of recording devices and media is considered a necessity for the blind, not a luxury: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization urge all members of Congress and others involved in the home taping copyright controversy to consider the needs of the blind and include in the legislation specific provisions assuring the right to a reasonably administered exemption for the blind from any additional costs which might result (directly or indirectly) from enactment of the home recording legislation; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that this organization work closely with the members

of Congress and others involved in preparing this legislation to assure that the interests of the blind are fully understood and secured.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-09

**Whereas**, the Honorable Larry Pressler, United States Senator from South Dakota, offered amendments calling for work incentives for the blind during consideration in the Senate of legislation to reform the financing of our nation's Social Security programs; and

**Whereas**, the Pressler amendments included both a reduction in and eventual elimination of the current restrictions on earnings applied in Social Security to blind beneficiaries of disability insurance; and

**Whereas**, the goals sought by Senator Pressler on behalf of the blind are similar to the objectives of advocates who support unrestricted work and earnings for recipients of Social Security age 65 and beyond; and

**Whereas**, Senator Pressler's amendments were considered in the Senate and adopted as part of that body's version of the Social Security financing bill. However, they were later dropped from the compromise bill, which emerged after negotiations between Senate and House conferees; and

**Whereas**, despite this setback, it is nonetheless encouraging to blind people that the United States Senate has again reaffirmed its past support for eliminating the work disincentives in Social Security which continue to hold blind people back from the productive life of our society: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federa-

tion of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization express official praises to Senator Pressler, as well as to his colleagues, Senators Jennings Randolph, Alan Dixon, and Roger Jepsen, who joined in sponsoring the work incentive amendments offered in the Senate on behalf of the blind; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we hereby reaffirm the long-standing commitment of the National Federation of the Blind to eliminate Social Security's disincentives to employment of the blind and urge support for this objective by all members serving in the 98th Congress.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-10

**Whereas**, the underwriting practices of insurance companies often place blind people into a distinctive class, frequently resulting in higher premium charges, based on the unsupported assumption that the blind are a greater risk than sighted persons seeking identical insurance coverage; and

**Whereas**, The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) has determined that underwriting policies which treat blind people as a separate class are discriminatory and constitute unfair trade practices, prompting the issuance by NAIC of a model regulation designed to prohibit insurance discrimination against the blind; and

**Whereas**, Congress is now considering federal legislation to prohibit discrimination in insurance against women and minorities (H.R. 100, the Nondiscrimination in Insurance Act, and S. 372, the Fair Insurance Practices Act); and



**Whereas**, the Honorable Jim Bates, United States Representative from California, has announced his intention to offer an amendment to H.R. 100 intended to prohibit discrimination against the blind in addition to the other groups proposed to be protected by that bill: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization commend and loudly applaud Representative Jim Bates for standing tall on behalf of blind Americans by joining us in an effort to stamp out insurance discrimination against the blind; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we urge all members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to support the Bates amendment on unfair insurance practices against the blind; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we call upon all lawmakers (federal as well as state) to work with the blind in order to make discriminatory insurance underwriting practices unlawful throughout our land.

#### NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND RESOLUTION 83-11

**Whereas**, National Industries for the Blind (NIB) has now admitted under questioning in a Congressional subcommittee hearing that it has spent so far a minimum of \$50,000 in legal fees involving the question of the right to collective bargaining by blind persons who work in sheltered workshops; and

**Whereas**, it was also admitted by NIB that at least eighty percent of the

amount spent in these activities against the blind came from federal revenues paid to NIB in the form of commissions for administering the Javits-Wagner-O'Day program; and

**Whereas**, NIB has attempted to flim-flam and fool the members of Congress by passing off this unconscionable diversion of federal funds as a "service to the workshops" and further stating that the same service would have been available to blind workers if only they had asked for it; and

**Whereas**, NIB's after-the-fact representation that legal assistance would impartially be provided to blind workers is preposterous, especially since the expensive lawyers to be provided by NIB have already concluded that the blind are not entitled to organize and act on their own behalf; and

**Whereas**, no one in Congress or the Executive Branch having authority over the Javits-Wagner-O'Day program has yet (at least, publicly) ordered NIB to cease and desist from future anti-labor activities, although the executive director of the administering federal agency did state that fighting labor unions would be an improper use of NIB's federal commissions: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization deplore NIB's misuse of federal revenues which has occurred in the campaign against the blind who are seeking to organize labor unions in workshops affiliated with NIB; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we call upon federal authorities to order the misuse of NIB's revenues to cease, after which there must be a thorough public



audit and disclosure of past expenditures in order to recover and return any funds spent so far without specific legislative authority.

#### NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND RESOLUTION 83-12

**Whereas**, the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act requires federal agencies to purchase certain commodities and services from industries (called sheltered workshops) which employ the blind or the severely handicapped; and

**Whereas**, from the time of its original enactment in 1938, the law has been based on the limited philosophy that employment in direct labor jobs would adequately match the skills and aspirations of the blind, hence the prime criteria to qualify a workshop for sales to the government is that at least seventy-five percent of the labor be done by blind or handicapped persons; and

**Whereas**, by its silence on matters such as workers' rights, provisions, and requirements for compliance with federal labor standards, the law lacks specific authority to require that workshops adhere to fair employment practices as a condition of participation in the Javits-Wagner-O'Day program; and

**Whereas**, funding arrangements to pay the costs of distributing nearly \$200 million in government orders annually do not require public accountability and permit expenditures of federal funds for purposes not specifically authorized by law; and

**Whereas**, Congress has begun to probe these and related issues arising under the current administration of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day program, starting

with hearings recently held by the Subcommittee on Manpower and Housing, chaired by Representative Barney Frank: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization express praise and commendation to Representative Frank and his Subcommittee for undertaking a review of issues related to employment of the blind in sheltered workshops; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that this organization urge introduction and passage of a bill making improvements in the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act, in response to the record now assembled by the Subcommittee on Manpower and Housing; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that, based on the demonstrated need for legislative initiatives to improve the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act, we call upon Senator Orrin Hatch, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, to initiate proceedings before his Committee, similar to those already underway in the House.

#### NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND RESOLUTION 83-13

**Whereas**, Representative Thoms Petri has introduced H.R. 3091, a bill in the 98th Congress to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to remove the minimum that is required to be paid to handicapped workers in sheltered workshops and in competitive industry; and

**Whereas**, this minimum (by law, fifty percent of the federal minimum wage) already contains waiver provisions which take effect upon issuance by the Secretary of Labor of Special Certificates

authorizing lower wages for individual workers below the fifty percent minimum; and

**Whereas**, proponents of H.R. 3091 seek to eliminate the fifty percent minimum but offer no wage protection mechanism to replace it, presumably expecting Congress to accept the notion that no one would exploit the labors of the blind or handicapped, although evidence that they do exists to prove the contrary; and

**Whereas**, repealing the fifty percent minimum would remove from the law virtually any form of wage protection for blind and handicapped people, being a symbolic as well as an actual retreat from more enlightened policies to assure legal protection for the rights of the blind and handicapped: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization oppose and deplore the proposed elimination of the fifty percent minimum wage, recommending instead full protection of the federal minimum wage for blind persons as proposed in H.R. 1078 and H.R. 991; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that all steps be taken within the power of this organization to bring the policies set forth in this resolution to the attention of responsible lawmakers, together with the request that no legislation be enacted which would diminish the limited wage protection which now exists for blind and handicapped workers.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-14

**Whereas**, coverage by the National

Labor Relations Act is extended to American workers engaging in productive activity in business and commerce; and

**Whereas**, blind people who work for employers called sheltered workshops produce millions of dollars of merchandise each year and perform their labors under the customary conditions of employment which are commonly found in factories and other commercial enterprises; and

**Whereas**, in spite of their legally mandated responsibility to employ the blind and their essential character as employers, workshops have sought to evade their obligation to accord blind persons the rights long established for persons in labor positions in the competitive workforce; and

**Whereas**, in recent cases presented to it, the National Labor Relations Board has found that blind workers in sheltered workshops are "employees" and entitled as such to the coverage and protection of the National Labor Relations Act, even considering the fact that their employers are sheltered workshops; and

**Whereas**, the United States Supreme Court let stand a lower court ruling, directing collective bargaining in one sheltered workshop, and another circuit court has concurred with this decision: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization express its most vigorous support for the policy of protecting blind workers from unfair labor practices and affording them the right to organize under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Act; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we commend the National Labor Relations Board for recognizing the employment status of the blind who work in sheltered workshops; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we urge the Board to continue asserting jurisdiction over the workshops, based on the realistic finding that the shops are largely engaged in business activity for productive, not therapeutic, purposes.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-15

**Whereas**, the American Association of Workers for the Blind (AAWB) has established a program which purports to certify Orientation and Mobility Specialists; and

**Whereas**, AAWB certification is required in many states by departments of education and rehabilitation, and health and welfare agencies; and

**Whereas**, AAWB certification is based upon the completion of a Functional Abilities Assessment Checklist which includes questions designed to preclude certification of blind persons; and

**Whereas**, blind persons have for years exhibited their competence as travel instructors providing excellent training in cane travel; and

**Whereas**, the American Association of Workers for the Blind has denied certification to a qualified Orientation and Mobility Specialist solely because he is blind; even though this person has completed a university training program in Orientation and Mobility and has been successfully employed by a rehabilitation agency; and

**Whereas**, this action on the part of the American Association of Workers for

the Blind promotes discrimination against the blind: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization condemn and deplore this unreasonable, discriminatory standard of the American Association of Workers for the Blind which automatically disqualifies blind people from being certified as Orientation and Mobility Specialists; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that this organization take all steps necessary to force the American Association of Workers for the Blind to recognize qualified Orientation and Mobility Specialists who are blind and to insure that this discriminatory treatment of qualified blind Orientation and Mobility specialists is brought to an end.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-16

**Whereas**, the borrowing of books free of charge from public lending libraries is a privilege extended to all residents of this country; and

**Whereas**, pursuant to Public Law 89-522, the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS), through its network of Regional Libraries, extends this same privilege of service to the blind and physically handicapped by circulating free of charge books in recorded and Braille format; and

**Whereas**, the reproduction of reading matter in Braille and recorded form requires permission of copyright holders; and

**Whereas**, there is now a trend for

copyright holders to sell copyrights to commercial producers of recorded reading matter, thus making recorded reading matter available for sale to the general public; and

**Whereas**, the selling of copyrights for commercial production of recorded books denies release of copyright to the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped for the production of recorded books solely for the use of the blind and physically handicapped, thus denying us the privilege of obtaining these books through the NLS system; and

**Whereas**, NLS has said that it cannot use Public Law 91-375 and Domestic Mail Manual Section 135 to circulate commercially recorded books in the same manner that NLS recorded books are circulated; and

**Whereas**, commercial recordings, which are the property of NLS and which are circulated to the blind and physically handicapped for their sole use, should qualify as Free Reading Matter for the Blind and Physically Handicapped under Public Law 91-375 and Domestic Mail Manual Section 135: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that we call upon the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to reconsider its position concerning the acquisition of commercially recorded books and the circulation of these books for the sole use of the blind and physically handicapped.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-17

**Whereas**, blind people depend on reading material in Braille and in recorded formats produced under the sponsorship of the Library of Congress for education, information, and entertainment; and

**Whereas**, it has become a practice that some charts, articles, appendices, and other materials are, from time to time, eliminated from the Braille and recorded editions of books and magazines; and

**Whereas**, sometimes the omission of portions of these materials is stated in the Braille and recorded materials, but sometimes no statement of this fact occurs; and

**Whereas**, blind readers have a right and a need to read the entire text of the print edition of reading materials: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization call upon the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped of the Library of Congress to include all text material in magazines and books which are produced in Braille and in recorded forms; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that if appendices, footnotes, and charts are not to be included in the recorded or Braille editions, this omission should be stated clearly at the front of the book or magazine and/or in the place where the material is omitted; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that, when possible, drawings, charts, and graphs should be described and note should be made of the print page or pages on which these drawings, charts, or graphs appear.



NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-18

**Whereas**, for many years blind and disabled students have successfully attended colleges and universities of their own choosing; and

**Whereas**, in recent years federal and state legislation has been designed and adopted to mainstream the blind and disabled into all educational institutions; and

**Whereas**, California State University at Northridge is seeking to have the United States Congress designate the University as National Higher Educational Center on Disability; and

**Whereas**, designating any school as a Center on Disability encourages segregation of the blind and disabled; and

**Whereas**, such segregation destroys the legislative intent to mainstream the blind and disabled into active roles in society: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization oppose the designation of any school or institution or higher learning as a Center on Disability; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we request the United States Congress to continue its efforts to mainstream the blind and disabled into all avenues of society by denying any request for the designation of California State University at Northridge or any other college or university as a National Higher Education Center on Disability.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-19

**Whereas**, there is at present only limited important technical information about financial affairs, investments, and the stock market available in Braille or recorded form to the blind; and

**Whereas**, more and more blind people, primarily the result of the activities of the National Federation of the Blind, are in a position to need such financial information; and

**Whereas**, the blind persons of this nation need more information about investments and other related matters: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization request the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to add additional books and magazines on financial affairs, investments, and the stock market to its collection.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-20

**Whereas**, the American Printing House for the Blind was originally chartered by Congress in 1879 as a corporation for the purpose of publishing books and producing educational materials for blind children in grades one through twelve in the United States and its possessions; and

**Whereas**, the American Printing House for the Blind is the largest publishing house of Braille materials for the blind in the world and is nationally and internationally renowned; and

**Whereas**, the American Printing House for the Blind has become a show place



and a symbol to America and the world in the advancement and training for the blind; and

**Whereas**, the American Printing House for the Blind receives an annual appropriation from Congress of approximately five million dollars for the production of books and educational aids for blind children in the United States; and

**Whereas**, the American Printing House for the Blind contracts with the Library of Congress to produce other Braille and recorded materials for the blind of America; and

**Whereas**, the American Printing House for the Blind solicits charitable donations from the public through the use of letters characterizing the blind as helpless and pathetic in order to obtain funds to assist in the publication of materials for and research and development of educational aids for the blind; and

**Whereas**, there are numerous blind persons who are unemployed in the Louisville, Kentucky, area where the Printing House is located; and

**Whereas**, as of March 31, 1983, there were 479 employees working at the American Printing House for the Blind, only 13 of whom are legally blind; and

**Whereas**, no blind person has ever held a supervisory or managerial position at the American Printing House for the Blind; and

**Whereas**, positions that were formerly held by blind employees have been reclassified so that a blind person can no longer qualify to do these jobs; and

**Whereas**, no blind person has been hired by the American Printing House for the Blind since February, 1980, to fill secretarial and clerical positions, jobs which qualified blind persons can easily

perform; and

**Whereas**, when blind persons have been employed, they were employed for the most part in the capacity of Braille proofreaders, jobs which traditionally have only been performed by blind persons; and

**Whereas**, this employment practice has resulted in the segregation of Braille proofreaders from the rest of the work force at the American Printing House for the Blind and has become a badge of discrimination, since only blind individuals have been employed as Braille proofreaders: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization condemn the practices of the American Printing House for the Blind in failing to employ more blind individuals and perpetuating the image of blind individuals as helpless and pathetic; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that the President of the National Federation of the Blind take whatever action he and the Board of Directors deem appropriate to facilitate change in the aforementioned practices and policies of the American Printing House for the Blind.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-21

**Whereas**, blind persons depend on recorded and Braille books and magazines for news, financial affairs, entertainment, and general information; and

**Whereas**, for maximum value it is necessary to have these materials in the recipient's hands as early as possible; and

**Whereas**, the few limited sources which produce this information and cause it to be produced include the Library of Congress, the American Printing House for the Blind, and some private organizations: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that we call upon the Library of Congress, the American Printing House for the Blind, and the private book and magazine producers to cut red tape and eliminate unnecessary steps in order to provide recorded and Braille books and magazines to blind readers as quickly as possible, thus reducing the time between the time sighted readers have the material and the time the blind have it; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that members and leaders of the National Federation of the Blind instruct post office officials and workers regarding the value to the blind of the Free Reading Matter handled by the post office so that post office personnel will be motivated to give priority attention to these important books and magazines.

#### NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND RESOLUTION 83-22

**Whereas**, Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) checks often do not reach their intended recipients; and

**Whereas**, these checks, in most cases, represent the sole means of support for blind recipients; and

**Whereas**, the United States Treasury Department has instituted a new policy of waiting thirty days before sending out duplicate checks—a policy which

replaces the former policy of a ten-day waiting period for issuance of replacement checks; and

**Whereas**, this policy means that recipients may not receive their duplicate check for as many as forty to fifty days; and

**Whereas**, this is unreasonable and insensitive to the rights, needs, well being, and literally the survival of blind Social Security Income recipients; and

**Whereas**, there are no alternative resources nor is there legal recourse available to recipients in this precarious position: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that we find that this new policy of a thirty-day waiting period should be rescinded immediately; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that this organization call upon the United States Treasury Department to reinstitute the former ten-day waiting period for the reissuance of Social Security Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income checks which do not reach their intended recipients.

#### NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND RESOLUTION 83-24

**Whereas**, it is well demonstrated that blind people can competently teach mobility, perform all duties necessary, and serve as competent instructors; and

**Whereas**, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, prohibits discrimination against qualified handicapped individuals by federally assisted programs, including training

programs, from mobility instructors for the blind; and

**Whereas**, responsibility for enforcing Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act insofar as mobility instructor training programs are concerned rests with the Office for Civil Rights in the United States Department of Education; and

**Whereas**, it is the understanding of the National Federation of the Blind that a review of the Boston College Mobility Instructor Training Program by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education has resulted in finding that Boston College does not discriminate against the blind in its policy of refusing to train blind people as mobility instructors; and

**Whereas**, a rule prohibiting enrollment of blind persons into mobility instructor training courses is blatantly discriminatory as well as being based on misinformation and false logic: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization deplore the findings of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, the net effect of which is to give license to discrimination against the blind; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we call upon the Department of Education as well as the Department of Justice to review and reverse the ill-conceived finding that mobility instructor training schools do not have to admit the blind.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-25

**Whereas**, many jobs are either closed

to blind people or severely limited due to the fact that the blind people applying for them cannot know without assistance what money is coming into their hands; and

**Whereas**, the one dollar bill, the five dollar bill, the ten dollar bill, and all other currency used in the United States is of the same size and color; and

**Whereas**, it would be helpful to the blind and the sighted alike if the currency of the United States were made so that the bills of varying denominations were of different sizes; and

**Whereas**, if the currency of the United States were made so that bills of varying denominations were of different sizes, it would enhance the employment opportunities for the blind: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that we call upon the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to create a currency with bills that vary in size depending upon their denomination.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-26

**Whereas**, in recent years there has been increasing interest in the accessibility of public transportation to handicapped persons, including the blind; and

**Whereas**, in line with this trend, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration of the United States Department of Transportation has commissioned several studies and reports which purport to address the needs and problems of blind

transit riders—the most recent one entitled "A Handbook Describing Low-Cost Concepts and Techniques to Make Public Transportation More Accessible for Visually and Hearing Impaired Persons;" and

**Whereas**, like previous reports, this report is also based on the erroneous and harmful notion that such physical modifications as tactile pathways, textured warning strips along platform edges, talking signs, and audible traffic signals will improve the mobility of the blind by making public transit safer and more accessible; and

**Whereas**, this report clearly demonstrates the authors' lack of understanding of the real needs of the blind, as well as a custodial, condescending attitude toward them. For example—1) the report repeatedly urges transit providers to work closely with rehabilitation specialists in work with the blind, despite its discussion of transit systems which have successfully worked directly with their blind riders on various projects, 2) the authors advocate further research on textured warning strips on platforms despite the cleaning and maintenance difficulties they cited, as well as their admission of serious accidents and fatalities on rail systems in compliance with current federal regulations, and 3) the report supports audible traffic signals noting that in Washington, D.C., the National Federation of the Blind was the only organization opposed to their continued installation, while the Blinded Veterans Association, the American Council of the Blind, and the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind supported audible traffic signals; and

**Whereas**, despite the disclaimer at the beginning of the report, its misguided

statements demonstrate a negative attitude by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration toward the capabilities of the blind to use transit systems or otherwise lead normal, active lives; and

**Whereas**, it is bitterly ironic that harm is being done to the blind by the perpetuation of negative attitudes and perceptions advanced about blindness, in the name of improving accessibility to the blind; and

**Whereas**, it has been demonstrated by tens of thousands of blind people across the country that given proper training and opportunity, blind people can and do compete successfully in society on terms of equality: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization once again call upon the Urban Mass Transportation Administration to cease disseminating reports based upon the false notion that physical modification for blind people is desirable and necessary; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that this organization call upon the Urban Mass Transportation Administration to consult with the National Federation of the Blind on matters of relevance to the blind; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that state and local affiliates work with their respective transit agencies to assure that policies and practices of these agencies reflect a positive attitude toward blind passengers.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-27

**Whereas**, every American has the right



guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States to speak freely and to associate with persons of his or her choice, including the right to participate actively in the National Federation of the Blind; and

**Whereas**, upon occasion, agencies for the blind attempt to coerce blind persons into refraining from participation in the National Federation of the Blind because of the agencies' hatred, hostility, and wish to control the lives of blind individuals; and

**Whereas**, Georgia Pace, a blind person, has successfully operated a vending facility in the Oklahoma Human Services Building in Ada, Oklahoma; and

**Whereas**, Georgia Pace displayed Federation literature in her vending facility and allowed the NFB of Oklahoma to conduct an organizational meeting in her facility to form the National Federation of the Blind of Ada; and

**Whereas**, when he learned of these facts, Mr. Dunlap, Supervisor of Vending Programs and Assistant Director of the Visual Services of Oklahoma, who is also a member of the American Council of the Blind, told Georgia Pace's supervisor to instruct Mrs. Pace that she may not display Federation material in her vending facility, that she may not participate in the National Federation of the Blind, and that, if she continues to do so, Mrs. Pace will be in "serious trouble;" and

**Whereas**, there are witnesses to these attempts at coercion and denial of First Amendment freedoms: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that this organization condemn and deplore

this attempt to deny First Amendment rights to Georgia Pace; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that we demand that the Visual Services of Oklahoma inform Georgia Pace, in writing, that she has the freedom to participate fully in the National Federation of the Blind; and

**Be It Further Resolved** that if written assurance is not forthcoming, this organization take all possible steps, including legal action, to protect the First Amendment rights of Georgia Pace.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-102

**Whereas**, dog guides afford an efficient means of mobility for many blind persons; and

**Whereas**, White Cane laws have been generally effective in promoting accessibility for dog guide users; and

**Whereas**, some facilities (such as hospitals) have called into question the meaning of "accessibility" as defined by the White Cane laws: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled this eighth day of July, 1983, in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, that we commend the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health and Human Services, for promulgating regulations regarding "dog guides in a health care setting" under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which regulations prohibit discrimination against dog guide users in such setting.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 83-101



**Whereas**, Article VI of the Constitution of the National Federation of the Blind provides in part: "Policy decisions of the Federation are binding upon all affiliates, and the affiliate must participate affirmatively in carrying out such policy decisions;" and

**Whereas**, Article V Section A of the Constitution of the National Federation of the Blind provides in part: "The Convention is the supreme authority of the Federation. It is the legislature of the Federation. As such, it has final authority with respect to all issues of policy...the Convention is not merely a gathering of representatives of separate state organizations. It is a meeting of the Federation at the national level in its character as a national organization;" and

**Whereas**, the language quoted from Article V of the Constitution of the National Federation of the Blind was adopted by the National Convention in 1958 and has remained in force unchanged since that time; and

**Whereas**, the 1982 Convention of the National Federation of the Blind (meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota) adopted Resolution 82-101 (copy attached), reaffirming the long-standing policy of the Federation that state affiliates are subordinate to the national body of the Federation; and

**Whereas**, Resolution 82-101 requires that affiliates ratify a Charter of Affiliation as a formal contract between the affiliate and the national body of the Federation; and

**Whereas**, the Hawaii delegation voted in favor of the chartering requirements, and Warren Toyama (then President of the Hawaii affiliate and its delegate to the National Convention) publicly said that

he would sign the Charter—and did, in fact, sign it; and

**Whereas**, the Hawaii convention was held March 12, 1983, and the members voted not to ratify the Charter, thus violating the very Federation policy which they themselves had voted to establish; and

**Whereas**, the National Office of the Federation (contrary to all past action and tradition of the Hawaii affiliate and of other affiliates) was not given prior notice of the time and place of the March 12 meeting and was told (in violation of the tradition and practice followed throughout the Federation from the beginning of the organization) that a national representative would not be welcome to attend the Hawaii convention; and

**Whereas**, this conduct of the Hawaii affiliate violated not only the traditions and practices of the Federation (traditions and practices followed throughout the organization and going back to the beginning of the organization) but also violated the democratic principle of the right of the people to hear all points of view and be informed; and

**Whereas**, the Board of Directors of the National Federation of the Blind met by conference telephone April 13, 1983, and voted that a letter (copy attached) be sent to the members of the Federation in Hawaii formally telling them of the policy violation, giving them notice of a meeting to be held May 21, 1983, at the Princess Kaiulani Hotel, and letting them know that they must either vote at that time to ratify the Charter or cease being members of the Federation; and

**Whereas**, the Constitution of the National Federation of the Blind (copy

attached) gives to the Board of Directors the power to expel individual members, local chapters, or state affiliates, or to reorganize an affiliate (see Article III Section E and Article V Section B); and

**Whereas**, the May 21, 1983, meeting of the members of the Hawaii Federation of the Blind was held at the Princess Kaiulani Hotel in accordance with the notice given; and

**Whereas**, the members present voted not to ratify the Charter and, thus, to withdraw from the Federation, the Second Vice President and the Immediate Past President of the National Federation of the Blind being present; and

**Whereas**, the National Federation of the Blind of Hawaii has been organized and is now functioning as an active affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind: Now, therefore,

**Be It Resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled in Kansas City, Missouri, this fifth day of July, 1983, that:

1) The actions of the Board of Directors of the National Federation of the Blind concerning the Hawaii Federation of the Blind are hereby confirmed and ratified.

2) The unincorporated association which was formerly known as the Hawaii Federation of the Blind and which was formerly an affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind is no longer an affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind, nor are those holding membership in that association members of the National Federation of the Blind—such affiliate status and membership having terminated May 21, 1983. The members of the unincorporated association deliberately and knowingly violated the policy

of the National Federation of the Blind and (after being notified of the violation and being given an opportunity to reconsider their actions) refused to reconsider those actions and persisted in the violation.

3) Filo Tu and the group he claims to head do not have authorization to use the name National Federation of the Blind, Hawaii Federation of the Blind, Federation of the Blind, or any variant thereof; and the right to such use is hereby explicitly denied.

4) The Officers and Board Members of the National Federation of the Blind are hereby instructed to take such actions and do such things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution and to insure that the National Federation of the Blind shall have the right to the exclusive use of its name and trademarks.

---

#### ATTACHMENT TO RESOLUTION 83-101

National Federation of the Blind  
1800 Johnson Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21230  
April 12, 1983

Dear Friends:

As you know, we passed (copy enclosed) Resolution 82-101 at last year's national convention in Minneapolis. The Resolution was very clear in its meaning, and it passed unanimously. Warren Toyama was Hawaii's delegate. He voted for the Resolution, and he later signed the Charter after publicly announcing that he would do so. I have a copy (duly witnessed) of the Charter which he

---

signed. Presumably he took these actions after consulting with the other Hawaiians who were present. His comments (which are recorded on tape) would indicate this.

At the convention he told me that he would bring the matter before the state convention for ratification in the spring of 1983. When I had heard nothing from Mr. Toyama, I called to ask him when the Hawaii convention would be held. He seemed somewhat embarrassed, but he explained that it was coming up the following week. I reminded him that it was custom and long-established practice for the National Office of the Federation to have a representative present at each state convention to give a national report, make the banquet address, and do the other things which signify that we are a single, unified movement. Warren told me that he did "not intend to have a national representative present this year." He said this was so because a discussion would be held concerning the ratification of the Charter. I asked him whether Allen Jenkins (a rather vocal member of the Acosta faction in California) would be there. He admitted that this would be the case but said that Mr. Jenkins was only an "old friend" and would not speak on the floor. I pointed out that Mr. Jenkins would probably speak in the bedrooms and the corridors. I have later learned that such was the case and that Mr. Jenkins spent a good deal of time attacking me, Dr. tenBroek, and the Federation in general.

Be this as it may, Mr. Toyama told me that he would call me after the state convention to tell me what was decided. He did not call. I called him. After some hesitation and equivocation Mr.

Toyama told me that the people at the state convention had decided not to ratify the Charter. I told him this was an impossibility. He said he had hoped that the national board would be understanding and would "bend the rules."

I reminded him that he was one of the ones who had always told me that the board should not go beyond what the convention had authorized and that he had been one of the very ones who had voted to require that all affiliates ratify the Charter, plus the fact that he had signed it himself. I told him it was not a matter of expelling Hawaii—that his organization was withdrawing from the National Federation of the Blind if it chose not to ratify the Charter. I told him I assumed that he understood that the organization would be required to give up the name Federation of the Blind if it continued to be unwilling to ratify the Charter and if it wished to continue to be an organization. He said that he did.

I suggested to him (and later to Filo Tu—who, I understand, was elected President of the state organization) that I was requesting that a state convention be called to reconsider the matter with a national representative present and that if the group felt it did not wish to ratify, then those who wished to remain in the Federation and abide by the rules, along with other blind Hawaiians who wished to become Federationists, would be formed into an organization and that the remnant who were unwilling to ratify would not be able to keep the name Federation of the Blind. The California courts settled the question decisively—along with the Iowa court, the federal court in Pennsylvania, and others. Warren and Filo

said they would consider the matter and call me back by the end of the week. It has now been over a month, and they have not done what they said they would do.

Accordingly, the national body of the Federation has determined to take the following action: On May 19, 1983, a team representing the national body of the Federation will come to Hawaii and talk with as many Federationists as they can reach. I am herewith calling a meeting of all Federationists in Hawaii, said meeting to be held at the Princess Kaiulani Hotel in Honolulu at nine o'clock Saturday morning, May 21st, 1983. This letter calling the meeting is being sent to the Hawaii Federationists on our mailing list here in the National Office. The purpose of the meeting is to consider whether the members of the current affiliate in Hawaii wish to ratify the Charter and remain in the Federation. If so, we will consider the matter closed. If not, then those who do wish to remain in the Federation and to abide by the rules, will be asked to remain, and those who do not will be asked to withdraw from the meeting room. Under these circumstances the team (now an organizing team) will remain in Hawaii until Saturday, May 28, 1983, at which time an organizational meeting will be held at the Princess Kaiulani Hotel at nine o'clock to bring into being a state affiliate. The affiliate will be entitled to the name, and any remnant of the old organization will necessarily relinquish that name.

We do not want to compel anybody to do anything, but the National Federation of the Blind has the right to have the kind of organization which it wants to have; and those who want to be a part of that organization and abide by its rules have

the right to do so and to be left in peace to do it. If there are members of the current state organization who do not wish to remain in the Federation and abide by its rules, we have no ill will toward them. We wish them well and will leave them in peace to conduct whatever business they wish to conduct. All we ask is the same from them.

Every other state in the nation has now ratified the Charter, and overwhelmingly the rank and file members of the Federation have made it clear that this is the direction which they wish the organization to take. Therefore, those who are (or have been) Federationists in Hawaii should consider the matter carefully and decide what they wish to do. Except for this one isolated instance, the chartering matter (with all that it implies) is behind us, and the members of the Federation want to move on to the constructive work of the organization. We want a strong, viable Hawaii affiliate to march with us as brothers and sisters in the movement—nothing more, nothing less. In May the individual members in Hawaii must stand and be counted and make their decision. May it be done in peace and harmony and with positive good will and love.

Cordially,  
Kenneth Jernigan, President  
National Federation of the Blind

P.S. The members of the team will have rooms at the Princess Kaiulani Hotel during the entire time they are in Hawaii. They can be reached there either for conversation or to confirm the time and place of meetings and that no change of time or place has occurred.



---

ATTACHMENT TO RESOLUTION 83-101

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
RESOLUTION 82-101

**Whereas**, the National Federation of the Blind is not a confederacy of separate, independent state and local organizations but a single nationwide movement; and

**Whereas**, the Constitution and policy decisions of the National Federation of the Blind have repeatedly emphasized this fact;

**Now, therefore, be it resolved** by the National Federation of the Blind in Convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minnesota, this 6th day of July, 1982, that all state affiliates of the Federation shall receive Charters of Affiliation and that those Charters shall be signed on the reverse side by an officer of the state affiliate and by the President of the National Federation of the Blind. If the language of the Articles of Incorporation or of any other governing document of the affiliate is inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter, said Articles or other governing document or documents shall be amended to conform to the provisions of the Charter. In affirmation of the spirit that we are an indivisible national movement, each affiliate shall (either by action of its Board of Directors or its state convention) ratify the provisions of the Charter and send notice of such ratification to the National Office of the Federation. Duplicate original Charters shall be signed for each state, one copy to be retained in the National

Office of the Federation and one copy to be issued to the state affiliate. No organization shall become a state affiliate and no organization shall remain a state affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind, until and unless it has received and executed in duplicate a Charter of Affiliation, said Charter to contain on the reverse side the following language:

Whereas, the \_\_\_\_\_ desires to be an affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind; and

Whereas, the National Federation of the Blind desires to have \_\_\_\_\_ as an affiliate;

Now, therefore, for these and other valuable considerations, the parties agree and covenant as follows:

WITNESSETH:

1) The \_\_\_\_\_ shall be entitled to use the name National Federation of the Blind, Federation of the Blind, or any variant thereof so long as it continues to be an affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind.

2) The \_\_\_\_\_ is a subordinate corporation to the National Federation of the Blind.

3) The \_\_\_\_\_ will be subject to the provisions of the Constitution of the National Federation of the Blind and the policy decisions of the National Federation of the Blind.

4) The \_\_\_\_\_ and its members shall (in common with all other affiliates and members) enjoy all of the rights and privileges of affiliate status and membership in the National Federation of the Blind.

5) This contract may not be altered,

---



abridged, or revoked in violation of the provisions of the Constitution of the National Federation of the Blind.

6) No amendment to the Constitution or Articles of Incorporation of the \_\_\_\_\_ shall become effective until ten days after such amendment has been sent by certified mail to the National Office of the Federation for purposes of review

and consultation.

National Federation of the Blind  
by: \_\_\_\_\_

by: \_\_\_\_\_

**CONSTITUTION  
OF  
THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND  
AS AMENDED 1983**

**ARTICLE I. NAME**

The name of this organization is The National Federation of the Blind.

**ARTICLE II. PURPOSE**

The purpose of The National Federation of the Blind is to promote the security and social welfare of the blind.

**ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP**

**Section A.** The membership of The National Federation of the Blind shall consist of the members of the state affiliates plus members at large. Members at large shall have the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities in The National Federation of the Blind as those exercised by members of state affiliates.

The Board of Directors shall establish procedures for admission of members at large, determine how many classes of

such members shall be established, and determine the annual dues to be paid by members of each class.

**Section B.** Each state or territorial possession of the United States, including the District of Columbia, having an affiliate shall have one vote at the National Convention and shall be referred to hereinafter as state affiliates.

**Section C.** Affiliates shall be organizations of the blind, controlled by the blind.

**Section D.** The Board of Directors shall establish procedures for the admission of new state affiliates. There shall be only one affiliate in each state.

**Section E.** Any member, local chapter, or state affiliate of this organization may be suspended, expelled, or otherwise disciplined for misconduct or for activ-

ity unbecoming to a member or affiliate of this organization by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors or by a simple majority of the states present and voting at a National Convention. If the action is to be taken by the Board, there must be good cause, and a good faith effort must have been made to try to resolve the problem by discussion and negotiation. If the action is to be taken by the Convention, notice must be given on the preceding day at an open Board meeting or a session of the Convention. If a dispute arises as to whether there was "good cause," or whether the Board made a "good faith effort," the National Convention (acting in its capacity as the supreme authority of the Federation) shall have the power to make final disposition of the matter; but until or unless the Board's action is reversed by the National Convention, the ruling of the Board shall continue in effect.

#### **ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AND ADVISORY BOARD, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND**

**Section A.** The officers of The National Federation of the Blind shall consist of (1) President, (2) First Vice President, (3) Second Vice President, (4) Secretary, and (5) Treasurer. They shall be elected biennially.

**Section B.** The officers shall be elected by majority vote of the state affiliates present and voting at a National Convention.

**Section C.** The National Federation of the Blind shall have a Board of Direc-

tors, which shall be composed of the five officers and ten additional members, five of whom shall be elected at the Annual Convention during even numbered years and five of whom shall be elected at the Annual Convention during odd numbered years. The members of the Board of Directors shall serve for two-year terms.

**Section D.** The Board of Directors may in its discretion create an Advisory Board, National Federation of the Blind, and determine the composition, duties, and qualifications of the members of the Advisory Board.

**Section E.** No person receiving regular substantial financial compensation from The National Federation of the Blind shall be an elected officer or member of the Board of Directors.

#### **ARTICLE V. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CONVENTION, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AND THE PRESIDENT**

**Section A. Powers and Duties of the Convention.** The Convention is the supreme authority of the Federation. It is the legislature of the Federation. As such, it has final authority with respect to all issues of policy. Its decisions shall be made after opportunity has been afforded for full and fair discussion. Delegates, members, and all blind persons in attendance may participate in all Convention discussions as a matter of right. Any member of the Federation may make or second motions, propose nominations, and serve on committees; and is eligible for election to office, except that only blind members

may hold elective office. Voting and making motions by proxy are prohibited. Consistent with the democratic character of the Federation, Convention meetings shall be so conducted as to prevent parliamentary maneuvers which would have the effect of interfering with the expression of the will of the majority on any question, or with the rights of the minority to full and fair presentation of their views. The Convention is not merely a gathering of representatives of separate state organizations. It is a meeting of the Federation at the national level in its character as a national organization. Committees of the Federation are committees of the national organization. The nominating committee shall consist of one member from each state affiliate represented at the Convention.

**Section B. Powers and Duties of the Board of Directors.** The function of the Board of Directors as the governing body of the Federation between Conventions is to make policies when necessary and not in conflict with the policies adopted by the Convention. Policy decisions which can reasonably be postponed until the next meeting of the National Convention shall not be made by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall serve as a credentials committee. It shall have the power to deal with organizational problems presented to it by any member or affiliate, shall decide appeals regarding the validity of elections in state or local affiliates, and shall certify the credentials of delegates when questions regarding the validity of such credentials arise. By a two-thirds vote the Board may suspend one of its members for violation of a

policy of the organization or for other action unbecoming to a member of the Federation. By a two-thirds vote the Board may reorganize any state or local affiliate. The Board may not suspend one of its own members or reorganize a state or local affiliate except for good cause and after a good faith effort has been made to try to resolve the problem by discussion and negotiation. If a dispute arises as to whether there was "good cause" or whether the Board made a "good faith effort," the National Convention (acting in its capacity as the supreme authority of the Federation) shall have the power to make final disposition of the matter; but until or unless the Board's action is reversed by the National Convention, the ruling of the Board shall continue in effect. At each meeting, the Board of Directors shall receive a report from the President on the operations of the Federation. There shall be a standing subcommittee of the Board of Directors which shall consist of three members. The committee shall be known as the Subcommittee on Budget and Finance. It shall, whenever it deems necessary, recommend to the Board of Directors principles of budgeting, accounting procedures, and methods of financing the Federation program; and shall consult with the President on major expenditures.

The Board of Directors shall meet at the time of each National Convention. It shall hold other meetings on the call of the President or on the written request of any five members.

**Section C. Powers and Duties of the President.** The President is the principal administrative officer of the Federation. In this capacity his duties

consist of: carrying out the policies adopted by the Convention; conducting the day-to-day management of the affairs of the Federation; authorizing expenditures from the Federation treasury in accordance with and in implementation of the policies established by the Convention; appointing all committees of the Federation except the Board of Directors; coordinating all activities of the Federation including the work of other officers and of committees; hiring, supervising, and when necessary, dismissing staff members and other employees of the Federation, and determining their numbers and compensation; taking all administrative actions necessary and proper to put into effect the programs and accomplish the purposes of the Federation.

The implementation and administration of the interim policies adopted by the Board of Directors is the responsibility of the President as principal administrative officer of the Federation.

#### ARTICLE VI. STATE AFFILIATES

Any organized group desiring to become a state affiliate of The National Federation of the Blind shall apply for affiliation by submitting to the President of The National Federation of the Blind a copy of its constitution and a list of the names and addresses of its elected officers. Under procedures to be established by the Board of Directors, action shall be taken on the application. If the action is affirmative, The National Federation of the Blind shall issue to the organization a charter of affiliation. Upon request of the National President the state affiliate shall, from time to time, provide

to the National President the names and addresses of its members. Copies of all amendments to the constitution and/or bylaws of an affiliate shall be sent without delay to the National President. No organization shall be accepted as an affiliate and no organization shall remain an affiliate unless at least a majority of its voting members are blind. The president, vice-president (or vice-presidents), and at least a majority of the executive committee or board of directors of the state affiliate and of all of its local chapters must be blind. Affiliates must not merely be social organizations but must formulate programs and actively work to promote the economic and social betterment of the blind. Affiliates must comply with the provisions of the Constitution of the Federation. Policy decisions of the Federation are binding upon all affiliates, and the affiliate must participate affirmatively in carrying out such policy decisions. The name **National Federation of the Blind, Federation of the Blind**, or any variant thereof is the property of The National Federation of the Blind; and any affiliate, or local chapter of an affiliate, which ceases to be part of The National Federation of the Blind (for whatever reason) shall forthwith forfeit the right to use the name **National Federation of the Blind, Federation of the Blind**, or any variant thereof.

A general convention of the membership of an affiliate or of the elected delegates of the membership must be held and its principal executive officers must be elected at least once every two years. There can be no closed membership. Proxy voting is prohibited in state and local affiliates. Each affiliate must

have a written constitution or bylaws setting forth its structure, the authority of its officers, and the basic procedures which it will follow. No publicly contributed funds may be divided among the membership of an affiliate on the basis of membership, and (upon request from the National Office) an affiliate must present an accounting of all of its receipts and expenditures. An affiliate which fails to be represented at three consecutive National Conventions may be considered to be inactive, and may be suspended as an affiliate by the Board of Directors. The affiliate must not indulge in attacks upon the officers, Board members, leaders, or members of the Federation or upon the organization itself outside of the organization, and must now allow its officers or members to indulge in such attacks. This requirement shall not be interpreted to interfere with the right of an affiliate or its officers or members to carry on a political campaign inside the Federation for election to office or to achieve policy changes. No affiliate may join or support, or allow its officers or members to join or support, any temporary or permanent organization inside the Federation which has not received the sanction and approval of the Federation.

#### ARTICLE VII. ASSESSMENTS

Each state affiliate shall pay an annual assessment of \$30. Assessments shall be payable in advance on or before January 1.

Any state affiliate which is in arrears with its assessment at the time of the National Convention shall be denied the right to vote.

#### ARTICLE VIII. DISSOLUTION

In the event of dissolution, all assets of the organization shall be given to an organization with similar purposes which has received a 501(c)(3) certification by the Internal Revenue Service.

#### ARTICLE IX. AMENDMENTS

This Constitution may be amended at any regular Annual Convention of the Federation by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the states registered, present, and voting. Provided further: that the proposed amendment must be signed by five member states in good standing and that it must have been presented to the President the day before final action by the Convention.







